REPORT RESUMES

ED 017 052 24 EA 001 072

NEW DIRECTIONS IN ART EDUCATION, REPORT OF THE INTERNATIONAL SYMPOSIUM (BELGRADE, YUGOSLAVIA, JULY 27-29, 1966). FINAL REPORT.

BY- BARKAN, MANUEL
NATIONAL ART EDUCATION ASSN., WASHINGTON, D.C.
REPORT NUMBER BR-6-1840 PUB DATE 20 NOV 67
CONTRACT OEC-2-6-061840-1247
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.50 HC-$4.60 113P.

DESCRIPTORS- *ART EDUCATION, *VISUAL ARTS, *INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS, ART EXPRESSION, *CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT, CREATIVITY, RESEARCH PROBLEMS, *INTERDISCIPLINARY APPROACH, ART MATERIALS, PUBLIC SCHOOLS, CONFERENCE REPORTS, CULTURAL ENRICHMENT, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, BELGRADE,

THE INTERNATIONAL SYMPOSIUM ON NEW DIRECTIONS IN ART EDUCATION, HELD IN BELGRADE, YUGOSLAVIA, JULY 27-29, 1966, AND SPONSORED COOPERATIVELY BY UNESCO, THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY FOR EDUCATION THROUGH ART, THE INSEA COMMITTEE OF YUGOSLAVIA, AND THE NATIONAL ART EDUCATION ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES, PROVIDED AN OPPORTUNITY TO DISCUSS SOME FUNDAMENTAL PROBLEMS OF ART EDUCATION. TWENTY-FIVE PARTICIPANTS REPRESENTED 11 COUNTRIES. THE MAJOR PAPERS AND DISCUSSIONS DEVELOPED DURING THE SYMPOSIUM WERE RELATED TO CURRENT INTERNATIONAL TRENDS, CONCEPTS, AND PROBLEMS IN ART EDUCATION. (HM)

DOCUMENT FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

new directions in art education
Dup

report of the international symposium
belgrade, yugoslavia, july 27-29, 1966

ED017052

EA 001 072

Final Report

Project No. 6-1840 -24
Contract No. OEC 2-6-061840-1247

NEW DIRECTIONS IN ART EDUCATION

Report of the International Symposium
Belgrade, Yugoslavia --- July 27-29, 1966

Manuel Barkan, Editor

National Art Education Association
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

November 20, 1967

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE
PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION
POSITION OR POLICY.

Published 1967 by the National Art Education Association, 1201 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. Information on securing additional copies may be obtained from the NAEA Executive Secretary. The International Symposium and the publication of this Final Report were supported by the Cooperative Research Program of the Office of Education, United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The proceedings reported herein were performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view and opinions stated do not therefore represent official Office of Education position or policy.

SYMPOSIUM PLANNING COMMITTEE:
Dr. Charles M. Dorn, NAEA
Dr. D'Arcy Hayman, UNESCO
Dr. Harlan Hoffa, USOE
Prof. Ljubomir Jankovic, INSEA
  Committee of Yugoslavia
Prof. Josip Roca, INSEA
  Committee of Yugoslavia
Dr. J. A. Soika, INSEA

EDITOR OF REPORT:
Manuel Barkan
PROJECT DIRECTOR:
Charles M. Dorn

United States Office of Education
Cooperative Research
Project No. 6-1840

United States Office of Education
Grant No. OEC 2-6-061840-1247

participants

BELGIUM
Dr. Emile Tainmont, Center for the Study of Positive Aesthetics
49, Rue St. Charles, Montignies-sur-Sambre, Charleroi
CANADA
Prof. Eric M. Dodd, University of Calgary
Calgary, Alberta
CZECHOSLOVAKIA
Prof. Jaroslav Brozek, Pedagogy Faculty
Gottwaldova 51, Usti N.L.
FRANCE
Mme. Aimee Humbert, Secretary INSEA Committee of France
Centre International D'Études Pédagogiques
Université de France, Seine-&-Oise, Sèvres
GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC
Dr. Karl Manthey, Humboldt University
102 Berlin 2, Burgstrasse 26
Prof. Heinrich Witzke, INSEA Committee of German Democratic Republic
1058 Berlin, Schonhauser Allee 50 A
GERMAN FEDERAL REPUBLIC
Dr. J. A. Soika, President of INSEA
Berlin-Grunewald, Douglasstrasse 32
GREAT BRITAIN
Miss Eleanor Hipwell, Society for Education Through Art
Hereford College of Education, Hereford
JAPAN
Prof. Saburo Kurata, INSEA Committee of Japan
1-6-9 Honcho, Koganei-Shi, Tokyo
SWITZERLAND
Dr. Robert Brigatti, Art Pedagogy Faculty
Im Rossweidli 70, Zurich 3/55
UNITED STATES
Dr. Manuel Barkan, The Ohio State University
126 North Oval Drive, Columbus, Ohio 43210
Dr. Charles M. Dorn, National Art Education Association
1201 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036
Dr. Harlan E. Hoffa, United States Office of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202
Dr. Leven Leatherbury, San Diego Public Schools
4100 Normal Street, San Diego, California 92103
Dr. Edward Mattil, The Pennsylvania State University
University Park, Pennsylvania
Dr. Eugenia Oole, Minneapolis Public Schools
807 N.E. Broadway, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55413
Dr. Edwin Ziegfeld, Teachers College, Columbia University
420 West 120th Street, New York, New York 10027
YUGOSLAVIA
Prof. Gojko Bobic, Secretary, INSEA Committee of Yugoslavia
Admirala Geprata 6, Belgrade
Prof. Ivan Didek, INSEA Committee of Yugoslavia
Ljubljana
Prof. Ljubomir Jankovic, Pedagogy Faculty
Trg Marksa i Engelsa 4, Belgrade
Prof. Hakija Kulenovic, Pedagogy Faculty
Drure Salaja 30, Sarajevo
Prof. Nedjeljko Magjer, INSEA Committee of Yugoslavia
Sviborac 6, Zagreb
Prof. Josip Roca, Pedagogy Faculty
Trg Joze Vlavovica 6, Zagreb
Prof. Ivan Tabakovic, Pedagogy Faculty
Pariska 14, Belgrade
Prof. France Ursic, Pedagogy Faculty
Jadranska 2, Ljubljana

contents

3 Preface

FIRST SESSION: Prof. Josip Roca, Chairman

8 Introductory Remarks
12 An Address: "New Roads to the Teaching of Art," Prof. Ljubomir Jankovic
17 An Address: "European Art Education," Dr. J. A. Soika
23 Discussion

SECOND SESSION: Dr. Charles M. Dorn, Chairman

26 Introductory Remarks
26 An Address: "Positive Aesthetics," Prof. Emile Tainmont
33 Discussion

THIRD SESSION: Prof. Josip Roca, Chairman

44 An Address: "New Directions in Art Education in the United States," Dr. Edwin Ziegfeld
56 Discussion
59 An Address: "Prospects of Art Education in Switzerland," Dr. Robert Brigatti
67 An Address: "Objective and Subjective Aspects of the Process of Pictorial Creation," Prof. Karl Manthey
71 Discussion

FOURTH SESSION: Dr. Charles M. Dorn, Chairman

73 Introductory Remarks
73 Discussion

FIFTH SESSION: Prof. Josip Roca, Chairman

89 Discussion
107 Report of the Summary and Recommendations Committee

PREFACE

The International Symposium on "New Directions in Art Education," held in Belgrade, Yugoslavia, July 27-29, 1966, was sponsored cooperatively by UNESCO, the International Society for Education through Art, the INSEA Committee of Yugoslavia, and the National Art Education Association of the United States. The twenty-five participants were invited on consultation among the four sponsoring agencies; eleven countries were represented--Belgium, Canada, Czechoslovakia, France, the German Democratic Republic, the German Federal Republic, Great Britain, Japan, Switzerland, the United States of America, and Yugoslavia.

Plans for the symposium were initiated and supported by the National Art Education Association with the assistance of the Arts and Humanities Program of the Office of Education, United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The INSEA Committee of Yugoslavia was the host.

In initiating this symposium, it was the general intention of the National Art Education Association to facilitate the assembly of a small group of art education leaders from several countries, thereby to make possible the kind of deliberations which large international congresses do not customarily allow. Dates for the symposium were selected which preceded by just a few days the meeting of the XVIII International Congress of INSEA in Prague, Czechoslovakia, thus providing the immediate occasion for this pre-congress assembly.

More specifically, the objective of the National Art Education Association was to enable the assembly of an international group of art education leaders so that

1) views, attitudes, and information on issues affecting education in the visual arts would be exchanged;

2) the study of comparative art education history, theory, methodology, and organization would be encouraged and fostered;

3) the international exchange of personnel and informational services related to education in the arts would be promoted;

4) relationships among various social, economic, and political factors pertaining to the support of the arts in education would be better understood; and

5) a selected group of articulate and influential American art educators could engage in extended conversations with colleagues from other nations to learn more about the directions and accomplishments for the study of art education in other countries and to make known some of the recent research and development activities of American art education, thus furthering the possibility for the American representatives to play a more active role in the international affairs of art education than had heretofore been the case.

The papers and discussions were given in either English, French, German, or Serbo-Croatian, and continuous simultaneous translations were provided. With only three exceptions, the text of this report was drawn from the tape recordings of all the discussions given in English and the simultaneous English translations of the papers and discussions given in the other three languages. The texts of the papers by Dr. J. A. Soika of the German Federal Republic and Dr. Edwin Ziegfeld of the United States were used as submitted; the text of the Report of the Summary and Recommendations Committee was also used as submitted in English. The transcript of all the tape recorded materials was very carefully checked and sparingly edited to preserve the intended meanings and the quality of the spoken word, while providing for readability.

Parts of some of the papers and discussions consisted of commentaries on lantern slide reproductions of children's art works. Since these portions of the transcript depended heavily on the reproductions for meaning, and since adequate duplication of the reproductions in this report was not possible, certain sections of the material were omitted from the text.

Any effort to capsulize the substance of the deliberations at the Belgrade Symposium would be foolhardy. Even a cursory glance at the text of the report will reveal to the reader that the papers presented and discussions given ranged the subject areas from the development of children through creative experience in art to the administration of art education in curricula for general education and to art teacher education itself.

As the deliberations unfolded, and as speakers and participants addressed themselves to the subject of the symposium--"New Directions in Art Education"--the value of the symposium became increasingly apparent. It did indeed provide a unique opportunity for a small international group of art educators to engage in extended discussion, some of it exploratory and some of it detailed, which permitted them to understand more thoroughly the problems in art education as perceived by the representatives of eleven different countries from West and East Europe, and from the Western and Eastern Hemispheres.

Regardless of the specific subjects under discussion, there were several themes which recurred time and again:

Capacities and tendencies toward creative experience in art are shared by all. Education in art needs to protect, encourage, motivate, and nurture them.

The problems of maintaining, extending, and improving education for creative experience in art are universal concerns of art educators in industrialized societies precisely because the general and conscious concern for creative experience in life is a product of twentieth century technological culture.

Capacities and tendencies toward creative experience in art require substantive aesthetic bases in order to flourish.

While development and experience in art are largely personal and subjective, they also rest on and require essential objective components. While experience in art is largely non-rational, it also contains rational components. While experience in art is largely non-cognitive, it is not devoid of cognitive components. Therefore, education in art weakens its potential effect to the degree that it oversimplifies by overlooking one or the other dimension of aesthetic experience.

The problem for the art teacher is to discover how to achieve reasonable and systematic teaching without violating the individuality of pupils and the personal and unpredictable qualities in their artistic expressions.

The problem for art education is to create the forms of curriculum which can educate students to value quality in present experience, to enable them to confront the future and derive wisdom from an enhanced appreciation of the artistic heritage through increased aesthetic discrimination and judgment.

Above all, art is a humanistic enterprise, and education in art is dedicated to the humanistic development of all pupils. Art education must, therefore, protect the diversity among pupils and maintain an open view toward the unpredictable in the arts, because protection of diversity and openness toward the unpredictable is the source of humanistic wisdom and richness.

And finally, the route to the extension and improvement of art education is through scholarly study of the issues involved, and the open exchange of materials, information, and personnel. Symposiums like the one in Belgrade help to underscore the need for such study and exchange. The means of fulfilling these needs can only be created through INSEA and its various national constituents.

The International Symposium on "New Directions in Art Education" fulfilled its purpose by providing a forum for the kind and quality of discussion intended. For the American delegation, it provided an invaluable opportunity to learn more about the status of art education theory and practice in the other countries which were represented, to communicate information about the developments in art education in the United States, and ultimately to become better able to view the work in American art education in the light of the international scene.

The Report of the Summary and Recommendations Committee of the Belgrade Symposium, which concludes the text of this report, was delivered at one of the plenary sessions of the XVIII Congress of INSEA when it met in Prague, Czechoslovakia, in the following week.

Manuel Barkan, Editor

FIRST SESSION

Chairman: Professor Josip Roca

Introductory Remarks

Roca: Comrades and friends, allow me to welcome you on behalf of the INSEA Committee and the Association of Art Teachers of Yugoslavia, and to wish you a pleasant stay in the capital of Yugoslavia.

The Yugoslav International Committee was only too glad to accept the proposal of the National Art Education Association of the United States to organize an international meeting in Belgrade for certain eminent experts in art teaching from Europe and from overseas countries. We are especially happy to hold this small international gathering prior to the INSEA Congress, which is to be held in Prague next month, to enable colleagues from Belgium, Canada, Czechoslovakia, France, the German Democratic Republic, the German Federal Republic, Japan, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, the United States, and Yugoslavia to meet and discuss topics in art education.

When working on the same problems, people become close to one another, regardless of where they live. Thus, art teaching, our field of interest, is a way of bringing us together. I should like to say that some of you who were kind enough to visit our country in preparation for this meeting have already become not only our acquaintances but friends of the Yugoslav peoples. Such friendship is created by people who know how to get acquainted with people, their traditions, and their achievements in science, culture, and art. As art educators, it is our task to develop in the new generation a capacity for discovery, for emotional and artistic experience. The confidence which you have shown in us and in the initiators of this International

Symposium by accepting our invitation to this gathering will strengthen international friendship and professional cooperation in this endeavor.

As Yugoslavia develops into a modern state, it is exerting great efforts in and devoting particular attention to education and teaching. An eighth year of schooling has been introduced, and there are great opportunities for further education. Art teaching is also attracting more attention. Yugoslav art teachers have managed to resist conservative conceptions of art teaching. They have succeeded in penetrating into the psyche of the young child, in activating his capacities for creativeness, and in accepting the child and his artistic capacities throughout his development. In teaching art--the foundation for the development of all creative capacities, general pedagogy no longer treats this subject as a boring one.

Developing the creative capacities of children and youth extends their capacity for creativity and promotes their knowledge of all the other sciences. The basic aim of art teaching is to liberate man from visual monotony, to develop his love for painting, sculpture, and the applied arts in his own country as well as elsewhere. If a greater percentage of people were to know the arts of other nations, then there would be more confidence among nations. To bring man closer to the arts is a very complex task, but it is also a beautiful one. So far, we have found great satisfaction on several occasions in being able to see international exhibitions in Yugoslavia, particularly exhibitions of the art of young children. Our art teachers are acquainted with the results achieved by colleagues in Japan, France, Belgium, the German Democratic Republic, the German Federal Republic, the United States, and elsewhere, and we are pleased that art teachers from other nations had the opportunity of seeing the achievements of their Yugoslav colleagues at international exhibitions.

Art teaching in Yugoslavia is now discovering new and more adequate methods for the secondary schools. Pressures in the regular curriculum do not allow sufficient time for art education. This problem is typical not only in our country but elsewhere, too. Therefore, we are confident that this International Symposium as well as the INSEA Congress in Prague will be of great assistance to all of us. Experiences and the results of scientific research in any nation are of interest to all of us; the subjects that we will discuss are topical for every art teacher, regardless of where he comes from.

Welcoming you and wishing you great success in this symposium, I beg you dear delegates to feel at home in our country.

Now, I give the floor to Dr. Dorn. He is going to explain how the idea of this symposium developed and how the meeting was organized.

Dorn: Professor Roca has asked that I say a few words about the background of our proposal to come to Yugoslavia and to organize this International Symposium on Art Education. This idea was formulated during informal discussions among Dr. Harlan Hoffa of the United States Office of Education, Professor Roca, and myself in Japan last summer at the INSEA Congress. We talked about a symposium involving a small group of art educators from throughout the world which might be held in this country. Following this discussion, Dr. Hoffa and I were able to come here in March of this year to talk further with Professor Roca and others of the Association of Art Teachers of Yugoslavia about the possibility of such a symposium. During the discussions in March, we agreed that such a symposium would be an important contribution to art education in the world and that we should proceed to make the plans. This decision was supported by the Association of Art Teachers of Yugoslavia and by my own association, the National Art Education Association of the United States.

In the United States, we feel that since World War II we have not been as close as we would like to be to the best thinking in art education which exists in many countries of the world. Our feeling that such a symposium was needed, therefore, came from our belief that an exchange of ideas would be important and beneficial both to us and to others. We were anxious to have an opportunity for all of us to gather together to share ideas on what new directions are available in the field of art education. This was the major reason for the development of this symposium. We look forward to exchanging views and ideas and discussing new theories which have been developed through research in our field.

As to our reasons for organizing this symposium, we have no further specific purposes in mind, although we do have several suggestions for later consideration.

In planning this meeting, we felt that an informal gathering of twenty-five or thirty art educators would offer advantages over the large Congress which will be held later in Prague. We feel that the opportunity for a warm exchange of ideas is very important, and we hope good things will come from this.

In summary, I would like to indicate some of the general considerations or objectives which we originally envisioned. I want to mention these to you because you might like to keep them in mind as we work together during the symposium. Our objectives were: 1) to exchange views and information about issues affecting education in the visual arts in our countries; 2) to foster and encourage the study of comparative art education theory, history, organization, and methodology; 3) to promote the international exchange of personnel and informational services relating to education in the arts; 4) to gain understanding of the relationships among the various social, economic, and political factors that influence the arts in education; and 5) to permit a selected group of American art educators to participate in such a symposium so that they could return to the United States with news and information about new trends and developments in art education and help Americans understand and participate more in art education as a world venture.

We are very much indebted to Dr. Harlan Hoffa and the United States Office of Education for their support and to the Association of Art Teachers of Yugoslavia for making this conference possible. We are obviously in debt to the Association of Art Teachers of Yugoslavia for the very excellent planning and development which are already apparent to all of us. We are indebted to them for the work they have done and for their very cordial reception. Thank you.

Roca: Some additional information will be given by Dr. Mattil.

Mattil: I would like to say just a few words as the past-president of the National Art Education Association of the United States. We are very honored and pleased to be able to participate in a symposium such as this, and we are most grateful to Professor Roca, Dr. Dorn, Dr. Hoffa, and all of the friends and colleagues who are assembled here.

Our association is a very young one in comparison to others, so young that its first president, Professor Edwin Ziegfeld, is here with us on this occasion. We come here with the main purpose of learning and sharing information.

Art education in the United States is well established. In many respects, it is very dynamic, but it is under constant examination because much improvement is necessary. As an association of art educators, we try to provide leadership in professional activities to bring about the improvement of our art education publications, to stimulate research in art education, and to encourage art curriculum development in the schools. We are very pleased to take part in this meeting with you, and we thank you for this opportunity.

Roca: Professor Jankovic will now give his lecture.

An Address: "NEW ROADS TO THE TEACHING OF ART," by Professor Ljubomir Jankovic.

There are some works of art which require us to look at them again, to which we return several times because they have some strength, because they radiate in some way, because they are always topical and always retain the charm of originality. This is the case with children's works of visual art, which we can approach from various aspects. They should be approached now in speaking about new trends in art education as being of recognized value.

Children's art works are interesting phenomena which have gone beyond the limits of the school to inspire certain great minds and enrich them through this experience. These works have advantages which similar expressive forms lack. As a result, free expression in art has become the main component of our program of art education for children, which is moving quite confidently along new paths in this direction.

The origin and sources of children's expression in art have already been determined. We can speak today of children's free visual expression. The evolution in different parts of the world is either greater or lesser, depending upon the conditions under which it developed. Where life as a whole and many of its aspects are intertwined with art, where there is a long standing tradition, where the environment has been favorable, and where necessary attention has been devoted to visual education, the evolution has been quite clear and obvious. What has been the development in this field in our country? Working from day to day in schools, we have discovered new, rich, and quite surprising results. We might say that the possibilities in this field are great and that, at present, they are flourishing successfully.

We have been working according to well-known principles, mostly with children from nine to fourteen years of age. At first the results we achieved seemed satisfactory to us. However, when art specialists went into the lower grades, we began to change our early criteria. This was also the result of the establishment of study centers in a few larger cities and research done into the interpretation of children's free artistic expression. We also started to change methods, topics, means, and materials. We organized various research studies and conducted some experiments. In spite of the wide experience we have gained, we are still endeavoring to study this field intensively.

The current important task is to determine the characteristics of children's free expression--spontaneity, creativity, and imagination--and its general educational value. Its characteristics must not be changed unless we want to jeopardize the basic value of children's art. The question arises during its development: to what extent would children's spontaneous expression suffer under different influences and to what degree would such influences be justified? The answer to this question should tell us what positive evolution there is in this field and the extent to which it is present in our practice.

Children's works of art are not only spontaneous reactions to the world that surrounds them and the expression of the images they have of this world, but they also reflect their own personal experiences in this world, a definitive action. The teacher's method in his work is the fruit of his intelligence. He should never violate the children's free expression. The teacher should support the spontaneous method of permitting the child to acquire positive experience. The teacher's presence should ensure an equilibrium between the heart and mind, which, as is often stressed, is needed. It is important to repeat and stress this point today, because the development of art in this half of the century is under the strong influence of the intelligentsia, and the influence of contemporary art upon art education is considerable. This influence has led to the tendency to apply one or another method used in contemporary movements in art to the education of the younger generation. Is the evolution of children's artistic expression during the last decade characterized by more and more rational elements? Or, perhaps is there already the possibility that a completely new system is being established in art education which will take over the present role of children's free expression? Or should we adopt an alternative--the possibility of parallel existence of spontaneous children's expression and other forms?

These questions also call for our choice either of a unilateral system, such as we had in the past, or of a program of art education which includes greater breadth and greater scope. In accepting this second alternative, which means a broader and more tolerant program, we would like to stress some of the values of free expression, which differentiates it from the narrower study. The choice of this second alternative could have significance in general education, in that this program is a specific expression for this age and therefore must be cultivated. It contains many plastic values, on the basis of which it is possible to develop further individual capacities for expression and understanding of visual works. It contributes to the further development of art education, helping to avoid a static observation of nature. The demand that form should be interpreted and created is something that we support.

In the evolution of the free visual expression of the child, we must not only consider how much the rational element is represented. There are some other elements as well. For instance, the maturity of the child's general capacities and his repression of banal reality might satisfy some pedagogues and psychologists. We also need to consider to what degree plastic values are represented in his expression. In order to modernize the child's spontaneous expression we must also introduce some elements which are foreign to him. It might seem paradoxical, but it is nevertheless true, that some archaic forms in children's artistic expressions seem more contemporary than the copies of some discoveries in art.

Another frequently discussed subject is the mechanical transmission of the visual method in other regions of the world without taking into consideration the environment, the traditions, or other important factors in the country. For all these reasons we have always tried to permit the child's expression to follow the tradition in which he has lived and to express a certain sensibility. Therefore, we have insisted upon differences in context and topics in various regions of our countries. Children's free expression is different in coastal regions, in the mountains, in the lowlands, and in large settlements. We understand the role of the environment, that there must be a difference between stone and brown buildings and intensely colorful villages of the plains. There is a difference between the mountainous regions of Slovenia and the distant plains. One is more easily represented by graphics and the other by visual techniques. We are aware of the strong tradition of the monumental fresco painting in Serbia and Macedonia, whereas in other parts of the country we find examples of still other arts. In the coastal area we have the freedom and dominance of the plastic art tradition and in Slovenia, the baroque. So it would be absurd to ignore the existence of these values in the development of our art culture in our younger generation. Also, it would be inadmissible to neglect the new values. These values come to light not only through painting or sculpture but also through architecture and through the use of other subjects such as fashion, graphic publications, and others. Visual art education cannot neglect all of this or overlook it, but it must make a strict selection from it.

Along with this we also foster free artistic expression through technical work concerning the solution of the treatment of plastic values. We gave up classical materials and adopted new systems of physical and chemical reactions for obtaining new plastic relations. But bearing in mind that everything should be accessible to children and should be spontaneous and creative, the materials cannot substitute for children's free expression; however, they can complete it and enable the children to better understand the different laws on a high level.

We gave up the traditional practices which we had adopted at the beginning of using a great number of techniques, but we do not think that in this special formation we have achieved good results in drawing or in works with colors. We try different kinds of material, for example, paper, wood, gypsum, foils of copper, aluminum, and many others in order to find the most adequate ones. The same holds true for other techniques. We have also noticed that there is a great danger that the technical and the monumental treatment sometimes denies visual values because these works sometimes remind us of hand works. This "inventiveness" does not contribute to achieving aims we have set in art education. Only rare examples show the positive use of free artistic expression, when through different techniques we get art which is more artistically mature. Besides acquiring other aspects of artistic culture, the pupils working along these lines should also overcome those critical phases from spontaneous towards conscious. For that reason we are not satisfied just because technique is learned, if basic aims in the broader plan are not fulfilled.

Our quest is not only to find new elements and introduce them, but we also tend to change and improve the quality of the already existing values. Children's spontaneous expression has changed along with introduction of these new values. New developments in other disciplines have led to extensions of research work in this sphere. But everything is more or less in the experimental stage. In the future we are faced with the necessity of setting up a more disciplined methodology. The nature of this kind of research is much more complex than it is in some fields, because the problems of measurement through instruments borrowed from other fields remain unresolved. The methodology of our experiments is not up-to-date in comparison to the research carried out in other countries. It is introduced in the majority of cases as an hypothesis, but an hypothesis should be verified and proved in practice. Well-known artistic procedures were simplified for a given age level. Everything was well studied except the ability of the pupils to assimilate this procedure.

Today the problem of research in this sphere is more complex for two reasons. First, there is the necessity to study a greater number of the external factors, such as the tendency to reduce the number of secondary school years and to increase the content of all the scientific disciplines and the tendency to decrease the number of lessons devoted to art. It is also necessary to discover more objective standards to appraise the results of a test. The other reason is the tendency to cope with problems of artistic nature.

For these reasons, research on such problems should be studied in a more complex way. It is true that our institutions and different organizations try to solve these problems; it is true that thanks to other organizations, INSEA, UNESCO, and the others, we can keep pace with the up-to-date developments. It is also true that methodology is slightly out-dated. Change in all the other spheres, and in art as well, is accelerating. Everything around us and in us is changing. Art along with science is in the front ranks of these changes and our obligation is to carry out research work to keep in step with time and to educate the younger generations in this spirit. Thank you.

Roca: Thank you very much, Professor Jankovic.

Professor Soika, the President of INSEA, will now bring greetings, after which he will give his lecture.

Soika: Ladies and Gentlemen. On behalf of INSEA, I would like to extend my sincere wishes for the success of this International Symposium. I am very happy that it takes place in Belgrade. I share your opinion that meetings of this kind, as well as the Congress which is going to take place in Prague with about two thousand participants, will contribute to international cooperation. With that in mind I wish you successful work in the symposium, and I thank the organizers on the part of INSEA.

An Address: "EUROPEAN ART EDUCATION," by Dr. J. A. Soika.

As we all of course know, the history of art education, in the widest meaning of the term, goes back to very early times. In Europe in former days, when crafts and art still formed one uniform whole, artistic education was provided automatically in the form of craftsman and artist training. Distinct beginnings of a systematic art education in Europe can already be found in the ancient world. Ancient Greece provides one of the finest examples of the artistic education of a whole people in direct association with religion. In the Middle Ages, the monastery schools took over Hellenistic and Byzantine art education.

The beginnings of an art education in the present meaning of the term--that is, for pupils of general subject schools from kindergarten to the final year of school--appeared in Europe with pedagogic realism about 1600. Between 1494 and 1800 many academies of art were founded in Europe, but at the same time schools of drawing were also established, which had an effect on the teaching of art in the schools.

In the eighteenth century, Jean Jacques Rousseau considered art education to be a pedagogic means in the development of human virtues. Demanding the development of all the potentialities in children, educators of the Western world drew up the first pedagogic art curricula. In his plan of education, the German Bahrdt, a contemporary of Basedow, emphasized exercises in drawing. They were among the first exercises in his school; children had to practice drawing to a considerable extent before they wrote. At this time, the first sight of a systematic practical education appeared in Europe. Since then cultural and pedagogic ends have been connected to economic ends in order to bring the school children of the Western world into an active relationship with the world of creative activity.

In 1830, as a result of tendencies of the disciples of Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi, (e.g. Friedrich Froebel) there were already exact curricula for the teaching of art and examination regulations for art teachers. Since 1880, the first European workshops for scholars and training colleges for teachers of these subjects have developed. As for practical craft education, it has been carried on mainly by the European associations in this field and by individual persons. Since 1900, there have been actual art schools (e.g. in Berlin) for training teachers of art.

In the reform of the European curricula about 1900, it was decided that the teaching of drawing should represent the plastic and graphic arts in the curriculum of the schools. About the same time, owing to the increasing constriction of the creative arts by rationalism and technical progress, European strivings towards art education were consolidated in the European movement for art education, which fructified all pedagogic fields. Since 1901, regular international congresses of art teachers have been held in Europe.

The European school reforms of about 1920 took into account the demand for improvement and intensification of purely intellectual training through art education. The social-pedagogic importance of art education was recognized in group and community work.

Now, art education in the Western world is winning greater freedom owing to the recognition of the genuine creative artistic powers of youth. Along with the representatives of the other creative subjects, new art teachers are filling the schools with artistic feeling and endeavoring to make them exemplary centres of expressive culture. At this time, the schools in all European countries have their own plans on the subject matter and the methods of teaching for art and practical craft education. The new art and handicraft teachers in the Western world are characterized by the unity of pedagogue and artist.

The development of education in art and related practical subjects was carried on in Europe mainly by the associations in these subjects, which have been active since the last third of the 19th century. The change in names (drawing--art education; boys' handicraft--practical education) shows how the reforms seek to escape from narrow aims and methods and reach towards the sources of art and creative inspiration. In the development of art education, the special journals for art and handicraft education and the constantly growing literature on this subject have played a special role. As for the conferences and exhibitions on art education, regularly held in all European countries, their task is to communicate the aims and the methods of present day European art education.

Today, in training provided at the art academies and pedagogic academies and in instruction at the schools, art and practical education in the Western world is divided into the following working groups, which have a fixed inner relationship:

1. Drawing (sketching, graphic printing methods, representative, expository drawing, instruction in perspective, lettering)

2. Painting (colour concepts, work in color using various methods)

3. Forming (handicraft work, plastic compositions, puppets, textile work, instruction on tools and material)

4. Building (instruction in building and modeling, instruction in form and environment formation)

5. Observations in art and handicrafts (analysis,

representative reconstruction, free creation
according to model, adaptation, imitative and
lingual-conceptual interpretation)

Since Pestalozzi, who characterized the cognition field of form as the oldest and most manifest along with those of word and number, important pedagogues have realized again and again that something important is kept from young people if the formative impulse, the will to form, is not taken into consideration. When the term "art education" is used as a pedagogic slogan, there is the danger that education "to" art is meant. If so, art education is conceived in a very narrow way as the elements of drawing and handicraft work, or as education to aesthetic "enjoyment." Admittedly, European education in art and practical work recognized at the start the necessity of an aesthetic education, but it is characteristic that the domination of conceptual terms was at first so strong that pedagogues even desired to teach the plastic and graphic arts by means of the word. It is true that the far-reaching and original spirit of Rousseau and Johann von Herder had already mentally overcome the elementary teachings and methods of the enlightenment, but this spirit did not penetrate to the pedagogic methods of art education.

Karl W. von Humboldt spoke out for the new aims, when he made the important statement that the pupils should learn to use drawing as a kind of language. However, the rejection of the formal instruction of history was only made possible by some advances and discoveries in the third part of the 19th century (1887 discovery of children's free drawing; C. Ricci "L'arte dei Bambini").

Thus, the teaching of drawing was put on a new pedagogic-psychological basis. The educational tasks of instruction in art and handicrafts came more and more into the foreground. Even if the aims of instruction in drawing still appeared unchildlike, it must be said that a living nature study, exercises in brush and color, training in seeing forms and colors and in sketching simple objects afforded more room to the creative abilities of the child. The educational value of handicrafts had been acknowledged; the fight against trash and rubbish had been taken up successfully. By means of excavations, the discovery of cave paintings and the art of primitive people and early cultures resulted in a consciousness of the origins of culture (back to nature; Gauguin; folk art; amateur painters).

Now the way was clear for a general artistic training.

The artistic education of young people was carried further, and soon greater importance was attached to the activation of the natural creative impulse in close connection with the nature of the child. Not only were artistic points of view taken into consideration; there was also a trend towards the study of cultural development. The pedagogic-psychological trends from America also had an effect on the reforms of 1900, as did the vibrating rhythms of Indian ink paintings and woodcuts from the Far East.

Parallel to the "art nouveau" (1895-1905) and to the strivings of the European handicraft associations in connection with criticism of the culture of the time, there developed in the West at the beginning of the 20th century a new living education in art and practical handicrafts. In various schools, especially in girls' high schools, the history of art was taught. The new aims in the teaching of art furthered an intensive cultivation of the wall decorations in the schools.

The revolutionary transformation in ideas of art (expressionism, cubism, futurism), the cyclic theory of cultures, and numerous ethnological and psychological investigations of children's drawings, modeling, and games led to a further reorientation of art and handicraft education. Since 1885 Franz Cizek had collected children's paintings, and in 1897 he founded his art class for young people at the Vienna Academy. Extensive exhibitions of "children's art" were held. At the art schools, special children's classes for freehand drawing and painting were established. In his "Theorie der Bildenden Kunst" (1926), Gustav Britsch investigated artistic finds from early cultures and child art with methods based on aesthetics and critical perception. In connection with primitive and child art, he pointed out the creative tendencies, the regularity of their development, and the uniformity of artistic thinking at the various stages of development. The result of all these discoveries and changes was liberation from the old drawing lessons and dogmatic teaching principles.

Present day education in art and practical handicrafts in Europe allows the teachers methodological freedom. Artistic education proceeds from an ability subject to its own laws and from comprehensive ideas of the stages of artistic development in the child and young person.

At the lower stages, the emphasis of art teaching is placed on the cultivation of the child's free expression. Puppetry and many new artistic methods--color instruction, letter composition, non-imitative rhythmic line, structure and color composition games, exercises in relaxation, hand work, building and new formative handicraft--are now practised in the schools. The perceptive and creative abilities present in the child are developed, bringing the young people into a personal and inner relationship with creative works of art.

Until children reach the higher grades, free hand drawing and painting is practised in order to awake the feeling for form and color. The pupils are accustomed to independent and purposeful working methods. Following their own creative exercises, graphic printing methods, and the study of monuments of art and architecture as well as exemplary products of craftsmanship, art teaching then aims at a productive consideration of art and handicrafts. The pupils are urged to produce artistic compositions for plays, exhibitions, and school festivals. Thus, European education in art and handicrafts aims at helping in the release of abilities, the realization of inner capabilities, the creation of the personality, and the intensification of cultural understanding.

The comprehensive aims of European art education fit in with the overlapping educative aims of the other subjects. For this reason, we reject any desire to teach art solely by the study of art and handicrafts because there are direct ways to a really inner and personal relationship of the young people to the artistic environment and to art - namely, their own creative work.

Within his limits, the young person creates from the same ability and according to the same laws as the artist. Today, European art teachers want to use every method to awaken the natural perceptive, comprehending, and creative powers of the young person and to develop them so that the resulting energetic forces will give the young people new inspirations and meanings. Such art education does not lie outside the intellectual field; it approaches the free but meaningful game. Since art education is based on the ability to think perceptively, its aim supplements that of the scientific subjects to use perception as a means to concept formation. Thus, art education demands an intellectual activity of a special kind.

The first purpose of present day European art education is to develop the inner person. Through artistic activity young people are afforded an all-round development. Comprehending perception and creative working, seeing and doing, eye and hand, belong together, for the perceptive and creative forces belong to the inner core of man. By developing spiritual relaxation and receptivity, art and handicraft instruction has an effect on total teaching. We all know how educative, liberating, relaxing, and healing these creative forces are. In view of the threatening danger of the mechanization of the human soul, it appears to be of the greatest importance to us European art teachers to help develop the creative forces. Here, we have a duty which goes beyond the actual subject of teaching. In this sense, art and handicraft education is a basic element of every life development and pedagogics. Therefore, at the present time, European art teachers are endeavoring to fit artistic education organically into total education. They no longer wish art and handicraft education to be a "technical" subject. Technical capabilities serve us mainly as means to the realization of creative intentions.

We European art teachers proceed from the fact that the impulse to form is an inborn feature of every man. We believe that without care and cultivation of the formative and creative forces there is no education of complete value. For this reason, European art education deals first and foremost with the education of man.

Discussion

Roca: Thank you very much, Dr. Soika. I now call on Professor Tainmont for a question.

Tainmont: Ladies and Gentlemen. According to Dr. Soika's report, I understood that there is a progressive movement in the field of aesthetic knowledge and that this knowledge is not gained in primary schools; at the primary schools there is spontaneous expression in all of the children's activities. These spontaneous expressions are never abandoned, but they are added to progressively by, on the one hand, technical means and, on the other hand, aesthetic knowledge, which I believe has to be taught.

I would like to ask Dr. Soika whether I have correctly understood his idea that spontaneous expression is never abandoned, for this is the creative expression of the individual, but that according to his age he increases his aesthetic knowledge, which will give his personality more creative power. Have I understood you correctly, Professor Soika?

Roca: Would Dr. Soika like to answer immediately, or later?

Soika: Yes, I would like to answer straightaway. I would like to say to Professor Tainmont that we are primarily engaged in giving the children a good and correct orientation and that in doing so we take care that the psychological, sociological, and typological conditions are observed. We strive to develop aesthetic qualities, to present them and teach them to children by using various methods.

Roca: Are there any further questions, and is Dr. Tainmont satisfied with the reply?

Tainmont: Yes.

Roca: Ladies and Gentlemen, a few months ago in Brussels, we had an international meeting at which we analyzed the work of Professor Tainmont. In a specific way things can be taught and learned through various methods that can help the teacher in his pedagogical work. I think that this is of particular importance. In my country it seems to me that we pay great attention to influencing the children's capacities. We want to stimulate them, thus keeping their fantasy intact, rather than exercising any kind of compulsion. We do not want children to produce routine work, so we completely agree with the efforts made in Belgium, particularly by Professor Tainmont.

Today it is possible for different techniques, set on sound foundations, to be used in art education. Thank you, Dr. Soika. We share your opinion that freedom of expression through different techniques will not contribute to the stereotyped or uniform results achieved through bad use or through limited use of too rigid aesthetic reflections. The difficulty lies in the fact that we should provide extremely broad reflections and liberties and numerous techniques. All these should be provided, but set on solid bases. But here again we are faced with the danger that this creative freedom may become too blurred. If liberty is great, then we are faced with the problem of finding the right way. A navigator, for example, can find his way on the sea during the night as well as the day, and even through storms, but he must be a good navigator and he must have a good ship. Thank you.

SECOND SESSION

Chairman: Dr. Charles M. Dorn

Introductory Remarks

Dorn: We will be privileged to hear a paper on "Positive Aesthetics" by Professor Tainmont from Belgium. Following his address, we will attempt to summarize and discuss the three papers which we will have heard at that point; at the moment I will give the floor to Professor Tainmont.

An Address: "POSITIVE AESTHETICS," by Professor Emile Tainmont.

Mr. Chairman, and dear friends, I thank you for your kind welcome. It is with modest intentions that I will try to establish and dwell on some general principles which are accepted by what we call "positive aesthetics."

The question arises, what is positive aesthetics? And why has it been born? What is its purpose? And how is it to be used? For all of these questions, all kinds of answers are possible--answers based on a greater or lesser extent of freedom, based on total freedom, or on total obligation. The choice is absolutely open, but positive aesthetics does not want to enter into this consideration of making a choice. In fact, positive aesthetics has invented nothing. It is not a new method; it does not represent a new method. All the methods can be used here. It is not a new aesthetic idea; it is not a special kind of aesthetics. Well, what is it, in fact? It is an attempt to point out and to establish artistic values in a piece of art. We should be aware of all of these elements; however, on a high level they require studies of about four years of work and experimentation. So in one hour I will just be able to tackle the problem.

Positive aesthetics is a limited, first of all scientific, if we might call it so, inquiry into art. Here we should undoubtedly understand the word "scientific" in the sense of human sciences and not in the sense of exact sciences. The research procedure is scientific; however, this is a rather dangerous term to use in the field of art. There is a trend toward mechanical creation if we take the term positive aesthetics too narrowly. This meaning cannot be applied here. Actually, German philosophers have already established a first basis for positive aesthetics in speaking about equilibrium, balance between different parts.

To begin with, we might call positive aesthetics positive adventure in art. This adventure, this attempt to establish artistic values, has been started because we are faced with industrialization, with the great diffusion of industrial products. Thus, we are faced with the idea of democratization of art, of the problem of comprehension and understanding of art. It is very dangerous for industry to throw products on the market that are not perfect from the aesthetic point of view. Instead of producing beauty, industry would risk producing ugliness. I have not mentioned examples, but you probably have many examples of ugliness and beauty in mind. In order to avoid this danger, it is necessary to make an effort in the sphere of education. All of our citizens are not artists; all of our students and pupils are not artists; all of our teachers are not artists, either. Artists, in our sense of the word, high quality artists, who do not need any kind of education, are extremely rare. We bow to them, and we call them "geniuses." Had we all been geniuses we wouldn't have to be teachers. Our mission as teachers is in fact dedicated not to geniuses, but to the general public, to the people in general.

Why has the idea of positive aesthetics occurred? It is a sort of reaction to the failures in teaching based on total liberty. We have studied this problem of total freedom thoroughly. We have come to the conclusion that professors in fact defended this total liberty in order to have the freedom not to do anything themselves. Also, we had examples of some pupils who were discouraged by the ignorance of their teachers. We have seen kilograms and tons of misused paper at the end of the school year, and we have also seen beautiful results. Those results were, in fact, the results of a selection made by the teacher at the end of the school year. Out of two or three thousand works the teacher could select fifty or one hundred of good quality and after that organize an exhibition that impressed everybody. I have carried out experiments myself, not with pupils, but just with people from the street. With people, with doctors, for example, who are no closer to the arts than children, when they wanted to wet a brush and work with it for half an hour, I could obtain work of which one or two percent was good. All the rest was without any value. This is not my opinion only, but the opinion of my colleagues as well.

So, we can make a statement that public authorities do not attach sufficient attention to courses of art education which are offered. And why? In studying this fact we learned that they considered art courses to be courses in a kind of fantasy. Some teachers come to school wearing special clothes; they do inconceivable things in order to impress people; they do not teach, their lessons are not valuable, and they discourage authorities, particularly those whose intention it is to suppress those courses. Through this discouragement the history of art survives. This is a well established fact--a very pleasant fact to note. Scientific drawing, too, survives. In Belgium, it is one aspect of the mission of art teachers.

In the teaching of fine arts or art education on the secondary level, the aesthetic effort is null. Technical effort only is important. Many professors use numerous and various techniques, believing that through these techniques they will find salvation. But nothing results. Nothing can be obtained by a technique if there is nothing behind it--I mean solid aesthetic knowledge.

Well, all our effort was restricted to classifying artistic values, which called for enormous patience; but, it would be too pretentious to say that we now know all the elements which are integral parts of a work of art. However, we can say that the jury judges the students. We give diplomas, we give marks, and on the basis of what? We all, for example, agree that certain work should be refused, or we all agree that such and such work should be accepted. Why? It means that inside, in ourselves, we have sufficient possibilities to make a judgement in order to give a positive or negative opinion. So it means that we have intuitive elements in us, although it is difficult to detach them and study them separately.

However, by taking as bases the work of art and the observation of nature, we have tried to establish some general principles, which have become what we call general ideas, including some principles. We cannot say that these principles are general, but we have harvested ideas from all the aspects of nature, from all the aspects of works of art. We have managed to harvest ideas common to all arts of all epochs and temperaments. The conclusion is that on the pedagogical level we are faced with knowledge which should be assimilated by pupils, knowledge which is not necessarily knowledge of the craft or knowledge limited to the history of art. However, knowledge of the craft and the history of art can help greatly in the assimilation of this larger knowledge.

So here a sequence of knowledge is in question. We were drawn into this river of knowledge. We were faced with a tremendous quantity. I cannot mention all these general ideas, and I speak slowly because the quantity of knowledge is so great. The problem is to know how to transmit it to pupils without disturbing their personalities. This is the problem, but this is a problem of methods, and it has nothing to do with the knowledge itself, which represents some undoubtedly valuable sum or totality which could be acquired. Many artists possess such a sum of information in a confused way, but many have not learned to classify and to separate this information from their intuition. We are art teachers, and we believe that it is our task to search for the best path on which to move from the intuition of the artist to the consciousness of our pupils.

As a result, we thought that teaching in stages was necessary. It is quite obviously impossible to touch upon all this information at one time. We, therefore, decided to try to transmit the information through stages which are not necessarily rigid. They are principally notions which we stress during our lessons, side by side with a whole quantity of other notions, in terms which, perhaps, are not clarified to a great extent, but we stress one particularly. And the creative feeling of the pupil remains exactly the same. The only difference is that instead of giving him a subject, instead of saying here, this is your subject--horse--he is faced with an aesthetic subject. He can take his horse, or he can take, of course, any other subject, if the teacher decides to give such different subjects.

But there is also an aesthetic subject; for example, the localization of a clear value. Some people may say that if this aesthetic subject is given, it is necessary to study this particular point. Is this obligation not going to lead to some difficulties, creative difficulties for the student? Perhaps that may be so; it is possible. But I assure you that it does not occur at the beginning.

It is obviously necessary that the student should acquire a certain amount of information. But as soon as the student has acquired the basic information which the teacher has chosen to give, from this moment onward, the student feels himself more and more capable of creating. He becomes a master of himself, and I have seen teachers who leave their classes for several days while the students go on working and achieving good results. The results are good everywhere, among all the students, because the teacher has made his point. Nobody could say that the products of his pupils do not reflect this method.

Through this method the students learn how to discuss. Everyone is astonished to hear young girls of thirteen or fourteen who give you their opinions of an artist or of the work of an architect and whose points of view are no longer those of children. Later on, the more knowledge the student gains, the more he will work on the basis of his intuition. And all this is a question of the degree of knowledge. For example, do you think that while I have been speaking here that I have for a single moment thought of a past participle or an adjective? Do you think for a moment that I have thought about this or that word which I should use rather than some other word? No, why should I? I have acquired a certain amount of information which I am presenting to you and which will appear in one or another way in various applications under different methods and in different ways. In the same way, you will, we believe, give your pupils an internal power without in the least limiting or restricting them from exposing their temperaments.

We are living in a period of enthusiasm, I can assure you of this. Our classes are happy classes. The children discuss, create, talk among themselves about their neighbor's work. We have replaced the individual task. We can look at our neighbor; we can work in accordance with the needs of our neighbor. At a certain moment we will have a specialist who knows how anatomy is created or who might say, no, this is not right, I would do this, and do it for a neighbor. In fact, conversations like this in the classes are always based on aesthetics.

The material to be transmitted is very complex, but I will give it to you very quickly. One should not consider it as a program which has to be imposed upon pupils of twelve years of age. I present this subject matter to you without any pedagogic order. It is up to the professor to find in this material something which he will adapt to the level of his students, to the primary school, for example, to the period up to twelve years old. Some positive aesthetic notions might be felt before this age; maybe not understood, but felt. With a fifteen year old, the same notion would not only be felt; it would also be understood. At eighteen or twenty, the same notion will be understood even better. It will be connected with other fields of thought. We have seen students who apply principles of positive aesthetics to the study of history. I have a professor of pedagogy who writes to me and says that from this year onward I will apply some principles of positive aesthetics in my lessons.

There are some possibilities of extending these notions and, furthermore, a possibility of extending understanding, for, of course, it is quite clear that all these matters develop in our minds--the minds of intellectuals. But, nevertheless, we must transmit them and bring them to a lower level--to the level of the people in general. Also, there are possibilities of adaptation and consequently possibilities of international understanding through the birth of a common vocabulary.

Now here is the material. We have attached great attention to the form of the reality and to absolute form. We have made a separation between the two, beginning with absolute forms, which are the most difficult to understand. They are those which prevent the student or pupil or teacher from confusing the representation and the rhythmic aesthetic part. However, we don't have to do this; we can do what we like. I can only give you an interpretation of positive aesthetics; afterwards, of course, all of this can be adapted to each individual. Therefore, absolute form, form of reality, study of values, study of colors can be included. Of course, all possible forms of expression should be taken into consideration—composition, for example, which is an adventure which we now base on original emotion. It is no longer a question of the moment when the recognition of absolute form is established, so that compositions are made on the basis of a pattern. They are made on the basis of a determined emotion which can then result in a certain pattern. Therefore, all the psychological climates which intervene in the course of composition, all the facilities of creation exist. You have noted that imagination and sensibility make possible creation which directly affects the behavior of the individual, as well as his reaction and his creation and finally the entire pedagogical material.

Now, I would like to tell you briefly how we organized this study of positive aesthetics in Belgium. The public authorities have agreed that a course of positive aesthetics be organized in the elementary schools, the secondary schools, and schools for training teachers. Besides this, we have also set up a center for studies and for diffusion of studies, which appeals to the professors in charge. No professor is obliged to come and listen to the speeches and the seminar at the center, but about 120 teachers come. Belgium is a small country, and I cannot give you comparative figures to show you what the relationship between your country and mine is.

The lectures at the center are divided into three cycles. In the first cycle we just present absolute forms, values, and colors. In the second cycle we study everything concerning forms of reality, and the third cycle is devoted to the practical application of all of this. However, using the center is not only a matter of listening to lectures; it is also necessary for the teachers who are the students there to produce work. And out of the 120, we have only 20 who managed to succeed in producing. That means that the center for positive aesthetics has proven that the education of professors in Belgium does not correspond to what we should wish. As to the 100 professors who have not managed to pass, slowly and gradually they adapt themselves; after a few years they understand and manage to pass the tests. Thus, they have not been lost as teachers. It seems that the objectives of a year's study of absolute form, colors, and values must be recognized.

The teachers were really surprised to see that there were only about ten to fifteen percent of them who managed to finish the schedule according to plan. All of this is done with the grace and cooperation of various professors. Some of them are sixty years old; some of them just associates who come to help their older professors. We even have individual lectures. We always try, I must say modestly, with great courage and obstinacy to overcome all the obstacles. The result is that the authorities are beginning to take this adventure seriously. The teaching staff is also taking it seriously.

Professors in mathematics and other subjects were lost when speaking about a certain subject, but the professors of plastics would answer this is this, this, and this. Then our program was taken seriously and finally recognized. I can assure you that the course is really becoming a very serious one. It has only been in progress for some ten years.

In conclusion, I should like to say that the knowledge of positive aesthetics can insure the success of a given work by a higher percent than when the method of pure freedom is applied. Out of fifty pupils about forty-five succeeded in making something really valuable.

Discussion

Dorn: Thank you very much Dr. Tairmont.

In attempting to lead the discussion this evening, I hope that my colleagues will be a bit more lively than they were this morning. We have heard three very interesting presentations, and at this point I hope that all of us have been stirred to propose ideas, to raise questions with any of the three speakers we have heard today.

Since some of my American colleagues are always speaking, I can't quite understand why they are not speaking now. I hope that they will have something to say. If you would like to address a remark to one of the speakers, I would appreciate it very much if you would identify yourself. Is there someone who would now like to raise a point? Dr. Barkan, from The Ohio State University.

Barkan: Like all of us assembled here today, I am looking forward to an intimate exchange of ideas concerning problems in art education and what may well be new directions in the field in some of our countries, whether they exist in other countries or not. Within that frame of reference, I'm rather fascinated by the combination of the three papers that we have heard today.

In a sense, it seems to me that both Dr. Soika and Dr. Tairmont have presented almost contrary points of view, which I think merit some discussion. For example, it seemed to me that Dr. Soika was talking about a quality of naturalness in the development of children's artistic expression. On the other hand, Dr. Tairmont was raising the very serious question of whether children can indeed be expected to express themselves naturally without some foundation of knowledge. It seems to me that he was arguing for art education to teach what one might call a sense of subject matter, or the content of art.

At the same time, Dr. Jankovic interested me earlier this morning with the alternatives that he indicated, which pertain to free expression and rationality. I would very much like to hear him explain further what he meant by rationality. Let me simply mention that some of the differences in points of view that have been suggested in these three papers are related to discussion and debate, indeed, to argument, among art teachers in the United States.

For perhaps a generation or more, art teachers in the United States have been trained to direct their teaching toward encouraging free expression among youngsters. At present, however—I mean during the last half dozen years—many of us in the field of art education in the United States have begun to doubt the wisdom of such a singleness of direction and have begun to wonder whether there are not alternative possibilities and indeed a subject matter in the field of art that demands attention.

It is difficult to ask any specific questions of the three gentlemen who have spoken. Let me simply try to put forward a thought, in terms of possible alternatives that might be considered and discussed further. One could say that the purposes of art education are multiple. The purpose of art education isn't necessarily to encourage the free expression of children, and it isn't necessarily to encourage children to understand works of art; rather it is to encourage and to educate children to understand, appreciate, and participate in the greatest endeavors that man throughout the centuries has undertaken. For example, the problem of artists throughout the centuries has been to create a sense of reality, that is a sense of what seems real to them in their own lives, in terms of their aspirations and the meaning of their lives and their culture. This really constitutes the essence of the history of art.

One could therefore say that the purpose of teaching art is to teach children to understand the greatness of artistic creation throughout the ages and, furthermore, to participate in present-day art and understand what artists today create. Now, one could say further that one way to achieve artistic knowledge is by way of personal creation. However, it is possible that pupils need not create paintings themselves in order to achieve such understanding and knowledge; they might also learn simply by studying works of art.

I would like to hear a little more from Professor Jankovic. Would you agree, for example, Professor Jankovic, that one alternative in the teaching of art might be the study of works of art, somewhat, let's say, as a critic studies works of art or, perhaps, as an historian studies them? In speaking of the way in which an historian studies works of art, I don't necessarily mean the identification of dates, places, and biographies of artists; rather, I mean the observation of works of art in relation to their time, and in relation to culture.

Let me return to what I started saying at the beginning. I'm fascinated by what appeared to me to be three rather different points of view expressed in these three papers, each of them pointing, in its own way, to what seems to me to be one of the foremost problems among art teachers in the United States, and I would suspect in other countries as well. Namely, what is important to teach in art, and what is the purpose of art education?

Dorn: Professor Jankovic, would you like to reply?

Jankovic: I think that we who have had the opportunity to speak to you at some length earlier could perhaps give our replies later when some other people have also taken the opportunity of putting questions and commenting on the subject. Therefore, I should like to answer later.

Tairmont: I do not believe that the papers which were submitted this morning are so far from each other. My impression is quite contrary; it seems to me that Dr. Soika, for example, stressed in particular the desire to develop all the creative possibilities and capacities in the child, and the spirit animating both my paper and that of our Yugoslav colleague's paper is close to this desire. I think that all three of us are bearers of a general feeling, that each ardently wishes each pupil to give his maximum.

What we generally do not hear about at congresses, however, are the practical means to achieve this goal. Positive aesthetics is only one of the possible means of realizing it. We believe in it because we have studied this problem and have used this method. We are therefore sure that we are not destroying anything, but, on the contrary, that we are activating profoundly individual creativity.

On the other hand, I understand our American colleague to have said that he also wishes us to stress teaching that goes beyond the individual. I'm not sure whether I have understood our American colleague correctly, and I beg you to forgive me if I have misunderstood, but I think that our American friend does not think it sufficient that a child should express himself within the scope of his personality. And here I completely agree with his idea, that is, that the individual should not be isolated from his time or from his society. An individual does not have the right to isolate himself from the community.

There is an individuality which egotistically produces for itself, but there is also an individuality which produces for the society, only for the society. However, there is a third individuality which produces for the society and benefits the individual. I believe that this idea opens up our mission, which goes beyond the personal realm in order to obtain understanding of others and to teach young people to study, understand, and criticize the arts, but not only on the plane which the pure historian is occupied with. I don't want to criticize, but, as you know, in the conception of the studies of the history of art there is not much of a place for the painting; there is lots of room for everything else but for paintings. But I think that our friend stresses the positive criticisms of art.

Our papers agree with this view. Dr. Soika is not against progressive aesthetic recognition. Maybe he does not introduce it at the primary level--I don't know what his opinion is on this subject--but he is not against studies of aesthetic knowledge. In the work that he showed us we could see the role of the mind. And our Yugoslav friend, did he preach absolute positivism, absolute freedom? No, on the contrary, he underlined that freedom is something living, that it is a necessity, and that he wished this freedom to be intelligently transmitted and understood, to be taught intelligently, for freedom is taught. One cannot say, "I am free"; one is taught and learns how to be free.

Therefore, I believe that we all agree on this matter. I do not think that in our three points of view there was any very important and considerable contradiction. The method I discussed is a possibility. Maybe if one were to use it in a very broad way, one might fully realize all of its advantages and disadvantages. Thank you.

Soika: Ladies and Gentlemen, I would just like to point out a divergence in the opinions and attitudes of different pedagogues in art, which is present in our three papers. I welcome this difference because I consider it to be a good sign for our work in different fields. This diversity shows that a new sphere of human interest is in question.

I think that we could state that our aims and the themes of our conferences and congresses provide us with possibilities to discuss postulates and principles. I think that the main interest is in principles, although the frames of reference are different. Much depends on the personalities and the experience of young pedagogues which create the possibility of comparison. We can confront or juxtapose the differences which Professor Barkan mentioned. I would like to welcome discussion of them because we should limit the discussion to some well defined problems. When we discuss problems, opinions differ, but if we define the limits of the problems, we can express our opinions more clearly.

Dorn: I personally would be interested in one point that

Dr. Barkan raised--an idea which has been expressed by a number of American art educators--that the history of art should perhaps be taught as a separate entity. Part of the discussion of the question here involves, it seems to me, the three speakers' concept of a gestalt which combines all considerations into one. If I interpreted Dr. Barkan right, he spoke of the question of art history being taught separately. Would anyone here care to react to this idea?

Taimmont: I'm not very certain that I have understood the basis of the idea of a separation of history of art and art itself. This is a problem at the present. In my opinion, everything depends on the age of pupils. If you are in the university, and if you teach the history of art there, of course, you have lessons completely independent from creative lessons in plastic art. If it is a question of secondary education, then it would be interesting to unite these two things, practical and historical knowledge.

If I take positive aesthetics, as an example, all the teaching we've conducted for the purpose of creation includes teaching the history of art as well. One could, perhaps, just observe a painting and generalize principles on the basis of it. Then, of course, it is necessary to make a study of a given painting in the framework of its historical meaning. So, I think that at the secondary stage these two elements shouldn't be separated.

A very sad thing is that half an hour every six months is allotted to a specialist in the history of art. In Belgium we had a special commission. A young lady tried to convince us that a separate course should be organized in the history of art, but I had to answer that the government wouldn't pay for a helicopter to enable you to travel from one gymnasium to another in order to complete your eighteen lessons a week, because in the gymnasium on the secondary level this division is not possible. If we were to have only two lessons allotted to art education we would be very happy, because in some countries it has already been suppressed. And to replace these two hours with five annual lessons dedicated to the history of art would be purposeless. So I think that the history of art and lessons in plastic art should represent one entity in secondary art education.

This combination of the two has been the germ of the struggle to introduce aesthetics. Some people wanted to convince the public that our courses are not purposeless. Some were of the opinion that practical work should be substituted for the history of art because we were not very organized, so we started by making the course more constructive. We tried to maintain its purpose, so the history of art now is taught by a specialist. It is not a defect to be a specialist in the history of art, of course. Thank you.

Brigatti: I should like to put a few questions to Professor Taimont. I was particularly impressed with the perfection and professional knowledge in the works made by his pupils. I was not, however, so much impressed with his elimination of extreme realism.

He mentioned tons of paper which has to be thrown into the fire at the end of the year. He claims that his method gives all the pupils a greater opportunity for achieving better results. I think that in an average situation this is not possible. In a class where there are more than twelve pupils, I believe that these results might be possible only if the teacher limits the students' tasks, presenting his subject in such a way that each pupil can make a good drawing of it because the teacher has already done much of the work. In fact, the teacher would have to make the greatest effort, and the pupil would not have to do as much. Thus, I think that Professor Taimont is right when he gives the name of the method under the picture instead of the name of the author of the painting. I think that there might be some confusion if these works were signed by the students themselves. Maybe we could put the names of the pupils next to the name of the method, because they are the ones who, thanks to the method taught by the instructor, managed to realize this work of art.

Such methods do not result in one work of art. However, I think that with this method there might be a kind of deceit of the pupil. In a way, the pupil is deceived because the direction is set for him. As far as the future is concerned, isn't this rather shortsighted? If we make the pupils so dependent upon their teacher, so that they can only create, only get good results after having listened to all his reasoning and his directions, might there not be a danger that the student will be incapable of creating anything independently?

I recognize that pupils can feel a great amount of joy when they see that the work of their hands is so good. However, I should like to see these same children later, as adults, when they are no longer led by a rational teacher, as they were in school.

I would like to make one last point. If we should orient ourselves towards this collective creativity of pupils, if we give them so many instructions and auxiliary methods, do we not at the same time decrease the opportunities for those who are very talented to discover independently; do we not in this way restrict the possibilities for their intuitive creativeness? Thank you.

Tairmont: I would like to answer to our friend that a thousand times in my life I have evoked ideas of a similar nature to his. In fact, we are formulating a great hope now, the hope that the students will maintain independency and that, if possible, the intimate creative aspect of the personality of the pupil will be developed further. Some colleagues still express apprehension, especially when they hear the principles of positive aesthetics for the first time. Their first reaction is always of the same kind. They say, "Well, maybe the teaching is too rational. Everything depends on the teacher."

First, possibilities for success do exist through pedagogical methods familiar to us, called methods of rediscovery. I hope you will understand me, although I use a word which might be too local, too personal. This is a method which allows you to rediscover through pupils the things that you have previously discovered yourself. So the pupil seems to you to be the proprietor of this discovery. The second idea which suggests success is the very fact that we build education in the plastic arts upon aesthetic qualities. This is what we are doing but it doesn't permit mistakes. If the work is not good, it should be corrected, so it's criticized. Thus, we obtain something that is not a work of art, but which is nevertheless valuable.

The idea of the stages is rather difficult to understand. Generally speaking, an art educator wants to obtain a personal creation from a pupil, and immediately. Regardless of whether this pupil is six, eight, ten, or twelve years old, he wants a creation in which he is going to discover the personality of the artist.

But, has the question ever occurred to you, what is personality? I wonder whether we all possess it, even we here. I would like to know whether there are so many different personalities among us.

This is an experiment we are conducting in the center. Out of fifty students in the academy, are there fifty different personalities? There are some wild personalities; for example, they throw their shoes on the blackboard, they set fire to beds, or they just spit on something and say they make a picture. And for another example, some students covered their faces with wax and then imprinted it on the board. Well, is this personality? We proceed stage by stage in order to discover personality. Later on the work itself discovers personality. If you come to Prague, you will see professors who teach young people initiated in positive aesthetics, to whom it is sufficient to give the subject; the results are good depending on the personality, whereupon nothing remains to be said. Remarks may be made, but they are personal on the part of the teacher; from the aesthetic point of view, nothing can be said.

Brigatti: I should just like to comment on what Professor Taimont mentioned. If some of the works of his pupils are the result of free initiative, he should also have shown us such works. Maybe there is a misunderstanding here.

Another point--I think that some of our pupils will be considerably above the average, although there are few of them. Therefore, on this point I completely agree with Professor Taimont. But I cannot agree that this minority should dictate to the others, should give the tone, the atmosphere. I think that this minority deserves to be mentioned separately and particularly. I do know several pupils in my own experience who are extremely talented, but I know that even these would not manage to bear such a pedagogical treatment.

Taimont: I'm not quite sure that I have understood completely the idea presented by our Swiss colleague. Of course, it is difficult to convince anyone, but you could have a course on the plastic arts based on the knowledge of positive aesthetics exactly as if you were giving a course of free expression. I wish to give you a very interesting example.

Authorities are not always in agreement with the tendencies of positive aesthetics supported by certain professors, because of the reasons that you mentioned--apprehension, apprehension, apprehension. Well, let me tell you that it was sufficient that we no longer pronounced the word positive aesthetics. Further, professors no longer mentioned positive aesthetics. From that moment onward education began, and teaching methods became completely correct. Why? Because positive aesthetics present knowledge for the professors, but they do not present a pedagogical obligation of imposing or orienting their courses in a certain way. You can teach a course exactly as you want without changing a single element. But when you are counseling your students, when you are expressing your opinion, for I am sure professors must give their opinion, at that moment the professor who is the initiator will give a better opinion than the one who has not had his eyes so well exercised and prepared for such judgment.

Let us not speak about methods. We can do whatever we want. The professor teaching geometry teaches it as he wants to, but geometry exists, equilibrium exists, contrast exists, purity exists. One uses it or one does not. One can do exactly as one wants, but it still exists in certain works. And I think that we can simply state this. Let us not demand anything of teachers. That is our point of view.

Barkan: I would like to go back to a comment that Dr. Soika made a few minutes ago, that it would be useful to identify and focus on specific issues to talk about. I think, that within the last ten or fifteen minutes, Professor Tairmont and Professor Brigatti have identified what perhaps may be a part of the heart of the problem. Let me try to indicate what that is, as I view the problem.

I don't think that it's a question of personality as contrasted to, or contrary to, rationality. I quite agree with what you just said, Professor Tairmont, that one of the problems in teaching art is one's view of, let me say for the moment, the realities of art. What I mean by this term is that the arts, through the ages, have expressed different senses of reality, different images of reality. Not only have the arts, as created by artists, expressed different images of the sense of reality, but so have the interpretations of art by way of philosophers and aestheticians.

Now, Professor Brigatti raises an objection to what

Professor Tainmont has presented as positive aesthetics, from the point of view, as I understood it, of the alternatives of personality and rationality. Let me raise another kind of objection. I would agree, first of all, with what Professor Tainmont has suggested, that to be able to exercise freedom, one must win freedom in the sense that freedom is based on some knowledge, some understanding. And to the degree that freedom is based on understanding, it is used more wisely. Now what bothered me about the conception of positive aesthetics isn't the notion that art education ought to be based on some knowledgeable foundation; rather, it seemed to me that it expressed a single-minded view of aesthetics. It expressed an aesthetics of formalism.

Let me refer to some passages in Herbert Read's Education Through Art. Read, for example, contends that in past centuries the arts were characterized by the personality of an age; the difference that he sees between the art of past ages and that of our present age, the twentieth century, is that during this century the arts have taken on a multitude of personalities, a tremendous diversity in personalities. Now my point in mentioning this is simply that throughout the ages philosophers and aestheticians have argued as to what the essence of art is. Some have argued that it is an ideal form. Some have argued that it is emotion, and some that it is form. Thus, I don't think that the problem for art education is to decide whether to teach for personality or to teach for rationality. Rather, the purpose of art education is to teach children, to teach people, indeed, to understand the variety of aesthetic alternatives which can help them to understand the arts.

It seems to me that the essence of art is its openness, the open possibilities that artists throughout the ages have created. Thus, the essence of teaching art ought to be openness. Now to the extent that the teaching of art is based upon the openness of aesthetic alternatives and aesthetic possibilities, to that extent the personality of the individual has its richest opportunity for flowering.

THIRD SESSION

Chairman: Professor Josip Roca

Roca: I want to introduce Professor Ziegfeld to give his lecture.

An Address: "NEW DIRECTIONS IN ART EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES," by Dr. Edwin Ziegfeld.

I should say at the outset that I shall take sole and total responsibility for this paper, whose title is "New Directions in Art Education in the United States." Originally, I had planned to get the opinions of my distinguished colleagues from the United States on this subject of new directions in art education. But I decided against that. Thus, I'm quite sure that they will not agree with everything which I have to say. It is said that scientists agree only in death, and I'm sure that it's the same with art educators. In any case, I do not presume to speak for anyone other than myself. If my American colleagues or any of the art educators from other countries agree with my ideas, fine, but I wrote this as a personal statement.

As art teachers, we must also be prophets, for we teach both for the world of today and for the world we imagine will be our habitat in the future. We develop the perceptions of young children not only to make them visually alive now, but also because we know that a visually alive adult is better than one who is not. We help the adolescent to discover himself and his world because we know that discovery of oneself and one's world must be an adult enterprise as well if fulfillment is to be found in life. We assist young people in understanding and appreciating historic and contemporary art because, if they remain understanding and appreciative as adults, they will respond to new art forms as they are created. I am not saying that education is only a preparation for adult life, but I am saying it must be that in part. And in accepting the role of teacher we are acting as prophets; that is, we are making assumptions about the nature of the world in which our students will be adults and the directions our field will take. To a considerable degree, therefore, we are all a combination of sage and adventurer, for as it ventures into the unknown, sound education demands a combination of wisdom and risk-taking.

In suggesting that all of us, as art educators, operate in terms of new directions, I at least make myself more comfortable with the task of this paper—to suggest the trends of art education in the near future. I have, I hope, made the reader feel that he, as well as I, might be making these remarks. All of us recognize that the future is comprised, in part, of factors which are unpredictable, and although we have no alternative to planning for it, we must realize that our plans are always partly invalid, that we must reprophesy and replan as the indefinite future becomes the real present.

My remarks will be addressed to directions in art education at the elementary and secondary levels. The first and most important direction which I will discuss has to do with the role of creativity in relation to art education at the elementary and secondary levels. The direction in this case is not entirely clear, so that I shall look at it in terms of a controversy—one on which I will make my own views clear.

The creative child is a product of the twentieth century. Children and young people have, of course, always been creative, but both the recognition of that fact and its partial acceptance in education have taken place within recent years. I consider this view to be one of the great revolutionary ideas in the history of education. In the past, education has been thought of largely as a process of transmitting to the student the ideas and values of his age and civilization; this is, as it should be, still a major activity in schools. The facility with which this communication is made still largely determines the success of the teacher. But the idea that the student has valuable views to set forth, that his uniqueness is to be fostered, that learning is an active and creative rather than a submissive and passive process, is new. We have been shown this by the countless studies of the researchers in the Child Study

Movement of the nineteenth century and by many (but by no means all) of the investigations that have been carried on in the area of learning, especially as they have related to the various fields of psychology.

It required artists and teachers of art to discover the child as a creator. Franz Cizek was the first of many who have shown us the range, vitality, and exuberance of the child's world. I remember well the excitement generated by Cizek's ideas, the interest they stimulated, the courage they gave birth to when I was a young teacher. We have learned much since his time, and we now question some of his ideas, but his was a giant stride forward, because of whose momentum we are still moving.

It is often difficult to realize how far we have come in accepting the view that all people are creative. I remember well from my early teaching experiences discussions I heard and took part in, often with other teachers who insisted that there was a considerable percentage of pupils who possessed no creative potential whatsoever, that creativity was not a commonly possessed trait. I believe that the idea expressed by these doubters has been generally replaced by the view that creativity, like most human traits, exists on a continuum from low to high and that all of us possess it in some measure. Psychologists have shown us that without intelligence a human being cannot stay alive; in the same way a person cannot exist if he is not a creative being.

During recent years, there has also been a more general acceptance of the individual as a creature of feeling. More attention has been paid to the importance of the non-rational in human behavior. In his book Irrational Man, William Barrett points out the crises in our civilization that have come about because of our overemphasis on the rational. Our earlier assumptions that all our problems could be solved by purely rational means have been proven faulty. It seems possible that the waves of irrationalism, which to some of us appear to be rising in many aspects of our world culture today, constitute a firm denial that rationality is the ultimate goal of human behavior.

The concept of the child as a creative person will remain in education until it is no longer needed or until it is replaced by one which is more urgent or more valid. We are viewing all people now as creative, because we live in a time when individuality is threatened. Most of the forces of our time are pressing us toward impersonality and conformity: the objectivity of science, the power of the machine, the methods of mass production, the institutionalization of more aspects of our living. It is these forces, and many more like them, that the individual must withstand, and he can do it only by being secure in his uniqueness. The years ahead give promise of even greater emphasis on those developments which first made us view the child as creative. Until these lessen, or until the arts have the same role in our culture as science and technology, the creative capacities of children will continue to be one of our central concerns.

I am not saying that the arts have a corner on creativity either in education or in the culture. All fields have their creative leaders, to whom we are indebted. However, the visual arts have made a particular contribution to education which makes them essential. Say what we will about the glories and triumphs of science and technology, the truth remains that they constitute strong pressures for insensitivity and for dehumanization because they tend to block the channels of creative, spontaneous, non-rational behavior. We maintain our humanism in spite, and not because, of them. The machine has freed us from drudgery, but it has also made most craftsmen obsolete in our culture. Computers are in the process of taking over many of the administrative and white-collar positions in all fields. We have been strengthened, but we have also been impoverished. The great liberation which the machine promises for leisure and more creative living exists by and large as a possibility. Making it a reality still lies in the future. Thus, the arts remain very important as the major humanizing force in a culture and in education.

Among a number of art educators in the United States, there has been considerable discussion about changing the major concern of art education, especially at the secondary level, from creative involvement with art media to a critical-historical approach, in which works of art are studied and analyzed and, presumably, appreciated. These ideas have attracted a considerable following and, until they are explored further, undoubtedly constitute a new direction in art education. Groups of art educators have met and planned art courses for secondary students dealing with the study of historic periods of art and with the development of aesthetic standards of judgment.

The rationale for the historical, critical approach is that students whose experiences in art courses have been largely or entirely in creative activities have not developed a knowledge of the major historical movements in art. It is certainly true that a person of even modest education should know something of our cultural heritage. However, I see no reason why, with even moderately competent instruction, the general student cannot develop his own creative abilities in art and learn about historic developments and aesthetic theory. Cognitive learning in art will enable a student to name an important work of art, locate it in time and style, and discuss it. This has value. But unless such cognitive learning is given a broad base of support in understanding art, arrived at through creative involvement, it means little.

Yet there are a number of articulate art educators who, seemingly distrustful of the subjective and non-measurable results of non-cognitive learning in art, feel that the cognitive has more value. I do not agree. Creative involvement lies at the base of our subject; through it we harvest the chief values of a school program in art. If I, as a teacher, can develop in a student a discerning and receptive eye, an openness to experience, and an ability to transform the visual world into his own reality, I feel I have accomplished my major task.

Furthermore, it is only on such a base that any meaningful comprehension of the art work of historic or contemporary periods can be built. As art educators, we are right in insisting that our students develop an understanding of great works of art. But, I believe that sometimes we expect a higher level of understanding and appreciation from sixteen-year-olds than they are capable of. We must remember that the sophistication which is necessary for mature understanding is the result of rich and extensive experience. The level of understanding which we expect of adolescents should be no higher than their experiences have equipped them for. After many years, we have generally accepted the truth that young children have their own view of life which, if it is to mature, must be accepted, respected, and built upon. However, we have not been similarly understanding of adolescents, but wish them to make an abrupt emotional and intellectual change from teen-agers to mature men and women. This is no more possible than is instant physical maturation.

We often forget, as well, that views of art and what constitutes greatness change remarkably from one generation to another. I recall some of the artists and masterpieces I was expected to respond to as a secondary school student: works of Guido Reni, Alma-Tadema, Andrea del Sarto, and Murillo. Many of those I was expected to revere are not now given much consideration, for our values have changed. They will probably change even more drastically in the next generation. So our smugness in knowing what works of art adolescents should know about and appreciate is both presumptuous and ill-founded.

I must add, lest I be misunderstood, that I strongly advocate that children and adolescents have contact with important works of art, both contemporary and historic, and that the study of works of art be a part of the art program at all levels, both as it relates to and grows out of the creative aspects of the program.

In my view, there are two possible reasons for this movement toward the historical-critical approach. One has already been mentioned: the security which is afforded by the objectively measured accomplishment of students. Thus, the movement is a part of a super-rational view of life and education, a view that is already too dominant.

Another reason is the feeling that the approach of creative involvement has been exhausted and that art education should move on to other things—or that the approach of creative involvement has not been sufficiently productive. It is certainly true that creativity, as a basis for learning, has become a focus of interest in many subjects including science and mathematics. I applaud this development, for I see it as a growing realization that man is, first of all, a creative creature. The visual arts, or the arts generally, have no corner on creativity, nor should they want it, for this would go counter to the concept of man as a creative creature. But it would be unfortunate indeed if, at the moment when acceptance of what art educators have long maintained becomes general, art education should give second place to this view. We will surely then have lost the initiative and will sink back into being a secondary and peripheral subject. The victory of the academic areas will be complete.

My own strong view on this matter is that creativity as an approach in art teaching has not yet been given a thorough test. There have been thousands of teachers who have brilliantly demonstrated its value, but if one visits many art classes at any level or studies the National Education Association report on Music and Art in the Public Schools, he knows that the majority of art instruction is not creatively oriented at all or is creative only to a slight degree; moreover, large numbers of students at the elementary and secondary levels have no art instruction whatsoever. Put another way, there has as yet been no nation-wide proof of the success of the creative approach. A goodly number of city and state systems have built programs of remarkable merit and excellence—so excellent, in fact, that I have difficulty in understanding how their value can be questioned. We have come a long way in proving our point, and we would do irreparable harm to education and the culture if we would abandon it now. I would mention once again that the concept of a student as a creative being is so revolutionary that we should not be discouraged if it cannot be made educationally operable on a wide scale even in some sixty years. We should remember that this time span includes two world wars and the almost equally dreadful periods of their aftermaths. More time is needed, because this concept alters or reverses many of the time-cherished ideas of education.

In taking this view that our future is based on a creative approach so strongly, I am not saying that our way is clear, or that we have all of the answers. There is much more to be learned about the experience of art, about teaching methods in art, about the qualifications of teachers, about suitable materials and tools, about teaching aids and their use. One of the inevitable new directions in art education is an increase in research activities. It is fortunate that extensive governmental assistance is available at a time when art education needs further research.

During the 1930's, there was extensive research in art and art education, but it had almost no effect on practice, and today it is hardly referred to. What is needed is more research which is designed in terms of the discipline of the art experience and directed toward an exploration of productive approaches and the development of new materials. There are other areas as well in which research could be highly productive. One which would involve educators from other disciplines of the arts would center on the development of integrated courses in the humanities. Another would deal with our rapidly growing problems of urban and community development as they are relevant to the field of art. If research in art education is to be productive, it must in many cases be freed of the requirements of objective proof. The problems we face are too large in scope to lend themselves to precise objective treatment and, furthermore, many aspects of art, by their nature, defy objectification. New approaches are needed and art educators are already at work on them.

In particular, I feel that much investigation is in order into the experience of art. As I see it, here lies the heart of the new directions. We have gone through a long period in which the curriculum was psychologized, in which values were defined almost exclusively in terms of personality growth and development. These are important values, but emphasis on them often denigrated the subject fields. We should teach art because it has direct values to provide the individual involved in it. These values need exploration and definition.

Another development which is already under way and which promises further growth is the inauguration of humanities programs in secondary schools. This idea was explored with some success during the 1930's, but was generally abandoned with the onset of World War II. Humanities are variously defined, but in all undertakings bearing that title, subject matter areas are brought together for instruction and study, generally by a team of teachers. I personally prefer a subject grouping which involves only the arts and in which the disciplines of the various arts are explored and their commonalities and individualities discovered. Humanities courses, if they can be proven workable, have the advantage of enabling a larger proportion of students (hopefully all of them) to have some contact with the arts in education. In fact, successful humanities programs can well lead to their inclusion as required courses. But there are several pitfalls that must be avoided. If it covers too many areas, a humanities course can easily become superficial or become as many small separate courses as there are areas involved. Care should be taken that the teaching of such a course be made a genuinely cooperative venture and that one or several of the arts not be allowed to dominate. Also, there is danger that one may succumb to a narrowly historical approach, for this offers a clear and noncontroversial method of organizing a course involving several fields. Clearly, the humanities approach should be explored further, for it provides a way to relate our field to a larger area of inquiry and to reach a larger proportion of the student body.

Another new direction has to do with the problems brought about by a highly predominant urban culture. While a century ago eighty percent of our nation's inhabitants lived on farms or in rural areas, the percentage has been declining rapidly. By 1920 the urban population exceeded the rural slightly, and by 1960 nearly seventy percent of our population was living in urban territory. The increase in percentages of urban population has been accompanied by increases in numbers of people so that large urban areas have grown at a greater rate than these figures indicate. Put another way, in 1960 the urban population, which constituted nearly seventy percent of the population, was concentrated in slightly more than one percent of the land area of the country. And we can predict that our total population will continue to increase and that the percentage of urban dwellers will also grow.

This shift to urban living, which causes cities to become mammoth in size, has several implications for art education. First, it gives some assurance that art will occupy an increasingly important place in education, for by and large, it has been in the urban areas and in the states dominated by large cities that art has been considered an important part of education. It is urban life that fosters and supports art, for it is in the cities that one finds most of the intellectual and aesthetic ferment of a culture. The 1963 status study of the National Education Association made it abundantly clear that a young child or an adolescent in a large town or a city was much more likely to study art as a part of his education than was a student in a rural school. Therefore, as cities grow in size and number, the chances are that most of them will provide a place for art in their schools.

The second implication is much less obvious but probably of greater ultimate significance. It has to do with the environment of the vastly increased urban student body and the implications of this environment for the program of art education. It is an obvious fact that young people who live in urban environments tend to choose predominantly urban subject matter for their expressive works. While this in itself is superficial, it illustrates an aspect of this environmental change which will, in all likelihood, have a significant implication for art education.

Although, as stated earlier, it is chiefly in the cities that the arts flourish, it is also true that artists have drawn on nature for their expressive work. It is through first-hand contact with the world of nature that they become aware of and sensitive to the forces of life. But for an increasing proportion of people who live in the city, that is well-nigh impossible. An urban landscape of steel and concrete does not relate a person to nature; rather, it comes between him and the movements and cycles of life. In a congested city area, one never sees stars or really knows the darkness and mystery of the night. Occasionally one glimpses the moon, but it is not possible to experience its immutable waxing and waning. A snow storm becomes a nuisance; a rainstorm, relief from the summer's heat. The constant environmental control which city life provides insulates us from nature and, for most people, the chance to see themselves in relation to all of life.

In *Man's Search for Himself*, Rollo May, the psychiatrist, points out that "people who have lost their sense of identity as selves also tend to lose their sense of relatedness to nature." What we will have in the future is large numbers of people whose contact with nature is slight, fragmentary, or non-existent and who will, therefore, be unable to identify with nature. The feeling of unrelatedness, already too frequent in these times, is bound to be heightened. This is not to undervalue the potential of the city as a generator of experiences. But if its potential to provide is great, its ability to withhold and deprive is fearsome and devastating. In congested urban areas, large numbers of young children have been found who, moving in hostile and barren surroundings, have not developed the simplest behavior patterns out of which socialization can come. They are alive in only an animal sense. They are not the responding, inquisitive, searching organisms that we are used to finding in the classrooms.

One of the commonest methods in art education is drawing upon the experiences of young people and using these as the bases of their expressions. Throughout most of the history of art education, the experiences of childhood and adolescence have been sufficient to provide an unending and vital flow of expression. But, until our cities are made habitable again, we will increasingly work with children and youth who must be made live creatures before they can be aesthetically responsive people. We will have a more basic task to perform than we have ever had before. I am not saying that the sensitizing of these young people is the task only of the visual arts. But, inasmuch as one of the chief purposes of the arts is the education of the senses, the role of art teachers will be important.

One of the shocking aspects of modern American life is the deterioration of our cities. Few of them have known any prolonged stability. They were built rapidly, they expanded rapidly, and their decline has been no less rapid. American cities impress one with their vitality and often with their exuberance, but seldom with their beauty. It is true that the commercial areas of most American cities are impressive and that many of the buildings are handsome. It is true, too, that the skylines of American cities, with their clusters of skyscrapers dwarfing all else, are spectacular and breathtaking. All American cities, as well, have suburbs with carefully tended gardens and lawns surrounding attractive houses. But the older residential areas, and in some instances commercial areas, have deteriorated. Often used for purposes for which they were never intended, they suffer from neglect, overcrowding, and general exploitation. One of the chief causes is the automobile, which in a few years has made a large part of the population highly mobile. As a result, the growth pattern of most American cities is characterized by the constant moving outward of successive groups from the city to the suburbs. The city itself, other than the commercial areas, has become rundown and shabby. Thus, while the suburbs flourish, the hearts of many of our cities are deteriorating and dying.

The city is one of the greatest art forms which man has devised. The great periods of man's history have always been evident in beautiful cities. Not that these cities have always been habitable for considerable portions of the people living in them. Imperial Rome, 18th Century London, medieval Paris—all had festering slums, and the Industrial Revolution contributed its full share of urban misery. But in the 20th Century, having accepted the tenet that all individuals should live in dignity, society can no longer afford to imperil the self-respect of any of its members by imprisoning them in an environment of urban squalor.

Art education has for the last twenty-five years set its goals almost exclusively in relation to personal and individual development. We must now direct our energies to social goals as well, especially as they relate to our surroundings. All large American cities—

and many that are not so large--are undergoing vast rehabilitation. In many cases, the future of the city itself is at stake. We know how dreadful the city can be, but we have been given glimpses of its possible glory. Imagination--and practicable proposals--are coming from ingenious designers; the chief limitation to their execution is the inability of people to see their value. Education in community planning falls clearly within the province of the visual arts. Thus we cannot neglect this important area any longer.

There are other likely developments for art education in the near future that could be discussed but which I will only mention. There will be an increase in the number of art specialists working with children and teachers in the elementary grades; leaving art instruction up to the individual classroom teacher has not generally been successful. The establishment of the middle school covering grades five through eight will occasion a vast amount of curricular restudy and a redefining of goals for this age group. It will most likely lead to the use of art specialists for all art instruction down to and including grade five. The emphasis on teacher education in art will continue to be weighted heavily in the direction of developing competence as a performer in one or several art fields. There will be increasing concern for aesthetic theory in teacher education. There will also be more use of artists as a resource at the secondary level in order to bring greater understanding of the discipline of art to all the students. In the same way, exhibitions will become a more frequent event at secondary schools, and exhibitions on a wide range of art areas will be made available on a circulating basis.

American participation in international meetings and exchanges in art education will increase, and its effect on art teaching will be incalculable. It will lead to a rethinking of goals and methods as we make contact with other ideas; it will stimulate many studies in comparative art education; it will give strength to us, and we, in turn, will be helpful to art educators in other countries.

In closing, I would like to mention something which I see not so much as a development but as an imperative for art educators--one on which I feel our future depends. If we are to bring into the schools the vitality which now exists in the art world and in the culture generally, we must become more aggressive in asserting our unique educational role and in securing facilities, supplies, and support to make that possible. We must increasingly see our jobs not only in relation to the students who have a particular interest in art and who in the secondary grades elect it, but in relation to the whole student body and to the whole community. Art is for all the people; until we reach all the people, we will have fallen short of our responsibilities. Although there are many factors working for us, time is not on our side, for there are many forces which prefer to see art kept weak and ineffective as a general educational force and confine itself to work with the gifted and with future professionals. Positive action in making our way must be matched by excellence of performance in teaching.

We will, therefore, continue in our dual roles as doers and prophets. New directions in art education will appear, and we will be affected by them. But, as art teachers, we must realize that we are also the creators and formers of new directions, and we must not avoid the challenges or shirk the tasks of this responsibility.

Discussion

Roca: Thank you, Dr. Ziegfeld.

Now, I will call on Professor Kulenovic.

Kulenovic: I don't want to separate myself from the presentations we heard yesterday and today, but I am not able to assess their value from the point of view of teaching and pedagogical practice adopted today in my country and in almost all the European countries. I think we can say that the foundation of all the presentations is the same, which is the most important thing, in my opinion. Their basis is a humanistic approach to art education, the aim of which is to liberate the personality and to develop and stimulate creative abilities, abilities which promote all the social, technical, artistic, and other features of progress, upon which Professor Soika insisted in his discussion. Professor Tainmont's presentation was undoubtedly equally interesting. Because these men use the humanistic approach, their points are acceptable to us as far as the theoretical side is concerned.

As to the practical side, at least of those shown to us yesterday, there I agree with the critical remarks made by Professor Brigatti. These realizations are contradictory to each other. They have been surpassed academically and synthetically, as well as from the point of view of modern academism. However, I stress again that it is not possible today to assess either the theoretical or the practical values of the presentations we've heard, including the idea of positive aesthetics expressed by Professor Tairmont, although I welcome it as a positive humanistic approach to the subject.

I would like also to point out clearly that the slides showed by Dr. Soika are very close to me. I hope that in saying so, I share the opinion of a great number of critics and pedagogues who have been able, in close contact with children, to understand their psychology as the basic premise for art education. We should keep this in mind, if we want to stick to the humanistic aims of art education, on which Dr. Ziegfeld insisted so strongly. The freedom of the child's personality is not an abstract theoretical postulate; it is, in fact, a series of theoretically defined psychological features of the child, as was shown by Professor Soika in his systematic presentation.

Following the development of integral aesthetic and psychological unity from childhood to maturity, one finds that development of the child's personality has critical periods. There are periods of stagnation, for example, during which ability is lost. And that principle should be kept in mind, particularly when we define the methodological approach. If we adopt the humanistic aims and principles of art education that we agreed upon in our discussions, then we must detach ourselves from the old academic practice, which has already been bypassed. And we also shouldn't adopt a methodology the aim of which is just to teach different techniques, not taking into account a psychological side and an aesthetic side of art education in children. Such an approach leads to the alienation of the human personality. Starting from the principle of the freedom of children's creativity, this means freedom from the fear of expression, freedom in the didactic sense from academic and pedagogical dogmatism. Taking this freedom as children's spontaneous creativity from early childhood into maturity, and as an individual's aesthetic adaptation from early childhood into maturity, we must put a question which even Professor Soika has not answered. How are we going to achieve such maturity in daily pedagogical work? Numerous works of contemporary psychologists and pedagogues point to this question. It is up to us art educators to find, theoretically and practically, adequate, practical methodological solutions which will lead us to our joint common aim of forming the integral, free, and cultural personality.

In this sense, I welcome some of the solutions of positive aesthetics, which was sponsored here by Professor Tairmont. Some of them could, in my opinion, be applied in teaching art to youths in the adolescent period and to mature adults. They could be used particularly in schools and technical classes, where the aesthetic considerations could contribute considerably to the aesthetic qualities of creativeness. However, I am not sure whether during his pedagogical and aesthetic research work, Professor Tairmont has also studied the methodology of this work and particularly the methodology of the tuition in secondary schools, in which, in my opinion, these aesthetics could be applied to the greatest extent.

I do not wish to make any final assessment of Professor Ziegfeld's paper, but I might say that I almost completely agree with all that he has said, and that I, personally, find much in his paper which is very close to us in Yugoslavia.

Yesterday during the discussions there was some mention of the teaching of the history of art. We in Yugoslavia have quite distinct stands on this matter, at least we who are represented at this symposium today. We go from the fact that the history of art is an historical science to the conclusion that it can have its place as such in the general education of children and youth, either as a separate subject or as part of art education in general. However, we believe that in the period of childhood, which means from early childhood up to adolescence, there is no need to teach the history of art as a separate subject, even with a minimum number of lessons. In our primary schools, the history of art is integrated with art teaching; that is, it is a part of the creative art lessons. It is brought up to date and represented in the curriculum of primary schools in the form of aesthetic assessments.

It is a fact that we still haven't found the best methods in art education in general or in the teaching of aesthetic assessment either. But I'm convinced that we shall agree that the results of the pedagogical and methodological research, which we have presented to you here on the broad basis of the general educational responsibilities of art education in the primary schools, show that we are oriented towards forming the kind of free personality which was stressed particularly in the last report by Professor Ziegfeld.

As for the teaching of the history of art in secondary schools, here we do not all agree. We are trying to find the best answers to the questions of how these lessons should be organized, how they can be brought up-to-date, how we can free them from enumerations of works and authors, and how we can bring these works closer to youth who are getting more and more alienated from true creative work and are becoming the victims of various amusements and teenager's excesses. Any of our colleagues' experiences would thus be of great use to us, if their aim is what we have already mentioned.

Finally, I must express my great satisfaction that this symposium has brought together the most eminent representatives of contemporary art education. There has been a unity of views on the basic questions of art education. After this symposium, I think we will feel greatly encouraged and will continue our work in art education and the education of children and youths to their benefit in the first place and also to the benefit and happiness of humanity as a whole, in terms of its progress and peace. In this view, I wish to express my gratitude to the organizers of the symposium who spared no efforts, no means, to get us acquainted with the achievements of contemporary art education which we sponsor today. Thank you.

Roca: Professor Brigatti will now give his lecture.

An Address: "PROSPECTS OF ART EDUCATION IN SWITZERLAND," by Dr. Robert Brigatti.

Thank you for your kind invitation. I highly appreciate having been provided with the opportunity to establish contact with a group of eminent experts; in this way we will be able to clear up some misunderstandings.

I have been invited by our colleague Roca to talk on art education, and I hope that my ideas will be discussed and compared to ideas in other countries. At the same time, I hope that we won't achieve complete agreement, for contention leads to new ideas and thoughts.

If we cast a glance backwards into the history of art education, we can see a series of one-sided solutions which, through the application of rigid principles, led to dogmatic attitudes. An example is the attitude toward works painted by eminent masters or some other valuable works belonging to a given epoch and culture, including those whose subjects were drawn from everyday life. In Switzerland, the greatest importance was attached to nature and to objects used in everyday life. Other subjects were considered less important, perhaps because individuals were afraid to assume a position of leadership or perhaps because of tradition and the social status of artists. In any case, art education in general was rather one-sided. Based on a set of absolute and generally accepted principles, it represented an authority and a kind of yardstick according to which we could define the pedagogue and the art teacher on one hand and the art work of the pupil on the other.

One of our methodological postulates was the idea of progressing from easy to difficult themes, from less complicated to more complicated perspective. Another idea was the materialistic concept of usefulness, which was the basis of every aspect of art pedagogy. The first idea was accepted in Switzerland and great importance was attached to it, because it corresponded to the psyche of the people in Switzerland and also satisfied didactic tendencies. The idea of usefulness and worth to the national economy was also widely accepted. It is important to point out this attitude toward usefulness, which is a limiting factor in the humanistic tradition.

When art pedagogy was subordinated to such ideas, the teaching became rather simple. Authority, of which we had too much, made us accept some recipes, and we can show examples of this. Methods and recipes are important, for they lead to good results. They also make it easy to evaluate both the pupils and the teachers. But a new concept developed which departed from them, a new notion based on the creative possibilities and talents of children. This new idea did not necessarily eliminate one-sidedness; the concept of the child as an artist also led to rigid principles and art pedagogy reduced itself to admiration. However, for the first time, relative value was attached to the authority of ideas. It got us back to the pedagogical process. It became the teacher's responsibility to create an atmosphere which would guarantee the creative freedom of the child.

There is a widespread idea that the creativeness of the child will inevitably find its full expression, but great obstacles were to be overcome. For example, there was a pedagogical trend or tendency personified in the so-called masculine element in pedagogy, a tendency toward unifying and equalizing, a tendency toward establishing pedantic purity. In any case, such natural obstacles prevented one-sidedness, so that the relativity of authority transformed itself into relativity in pedagogy as a whole.

In the present day situation, the art educator is no longer simply a part of an ingrown tradition which is accepted in education, has a certain role to play, and is expected to get some results. Today, the art educator feels quite different, for his methods of teaching depend upon his own choice. Although some influences that originate in the past can still be felt today, he is completely independent. However, he has to recognize some valuable and valid aspects of the tendencies of the past. He must also assess his own efforts on the basis of the results achieved by his pupils. Therefore, the art educator's task is still a very complex one. He is expected to know his pupils' stages of development and to take full consideration of them. He is also asked to keep pace with the diversity of art today. He has to choose between one material and another, between one idea and another, and to find criteria for the works of his children which will lead to a higher level and better quality in his pupils' work. He is faced with several problems during these efforts.

The teacher is also obliged to determine the boundary between his own and the pupil's freedom. A problem arises as to whether the teacher should impose certain things upon his students, or whether he should concentrate on those who are most talented. Or, should he make his greatest efforts with those who are weak, leaving the talented ones to help themselves? How many students can he have in his class and still take full consideration of individual talents, of each child's stage of development? Can he use his private standards as principles? Or, does he not in this way obviate some ideas as they exist among the children? What is the dominant, rational, technical, and constructive interest of his students? Does it not lead him to some satisfaction? And must he not, therefore, adapt himself to the possibilities, the abilities, of his students, which in turn demands that he also devote his efforts to the irrational, emotional feelings of his students?

Would it not be useful to stress the great values of certain artistic epochs, or must the teacher use contemporary art? How can he struggle against the utilitarian orientation, while at the same time maintaining usefulness as one of the aspects of his teaching method? How can he improve his teaching methodologically when faced with complicated movements? Should he improvise spontaneously and thus try to make his teaching livelier?

All these problems are extremely complicated, and questions like them can be put endlessly. However, it is important that we realize that many of these problems cannot be solved immediately or forever. It is difficult to get a final answer; thinking about the character of the pupil, the personality of the teacher, and about each individual situation, demands individual efforts and solutions. Very often we will have quite contradictory responses. Therefore, an art educator must be prepared to be a man who keeps searching in each new situation, who is quite open to new solutions.

In this sense his subjectivity becomes conscious. He is engaged personally and is thus not an objective judge or expert. He does not stick rigidly to what was an authority earlier. His objective opinion can be seen in different stages of his teaching or through his artistic abilities. What is important is that it should fit each individual situation. Its intensification then must grow with the greater diversity which enables him to animate his listeners, taking into consideration, of course, that they are a group of different people who have to be led, and that they are not well acquainted with the technical side of art or with the theory of creative possibilities. So he has to be a research worker and an educator at the same time.

If the art educator is aware of the duality of his role, if he sees this responsibility as an advantage rather than a disadvantage, it develops his love for his profession; then he can be fully engaged in his work. He thus creates a sound foundation on which he can build his own personal authority as demanded by present day education, which requires, in the first place, knowledge of oneself, and which also demands that the teacher develop during his work and improve his own qualities. This is an aspect of pedagogy that has to be taken into consideration.

If we study the relationship between art educators and the task facing them today, we have to come to the conclusion that only a few of them are able to fulfill their tasks. The great majority, it seems to me, feels this complex situation as a great disadvantage, as a burden.

It is evident that there is a great necessity for freedom of pedagogical principles, a clear thesis, and simple techniques. Having too few techniques leads, of course, to limitations, because the teacher himself does not know them thoroughly. On the other hand, if there are too many techniques, advancement is also endangered. When the charm of the new is dissipated, then the desire to create is born, and everybody hopes that a technique will become a new means of creation. If too great freedom is permitted, freedom which, in fact, hides real imitation, there is an attempt to satisfy superficial aims because it is very easy just to adopt given recipes.

But, here we must add that with an assessment of the works of pupils, we can present ourselves to the public. Certain pedagogues try to impose themselves on the public, neglecting the deep necessity of a personal education. Thus, every pupil achieves work which is as close as possible to the so-called acceptable work, but his free work is so bad that the assistance of the teacher becomes absolutely necessary. Because the pupil depends completely on the authority of the teacher, he is devoid of internal certainty and self-confidence. The authority of art pedagogy is endangered in such a case, because seriousness and self-confidence is are jeopardized.

Some qualities have economic values, some only cultural values. When everyone is given a rationalistic basis and a clear definition, he develops sufficient self-confidence, preventing him from questioning some values. This position on one side can cause pedagogues to lose self-confidence. If I were to make a judgment, then I would say that all art pedagogues want to accept something new, and not only passively; they also want to take an active part in it. They want to accept it. Because so many great changes occurred in the last decade, many got used to constant and rapid changes in the different streams in art, changes which stimulated them still more. If I wanted to rectify the situation of art pedagogues, then I would direct them toward deeper needs concerning more intimate aspects and fewer conscious aspects.

It is satisfying to know that these art pedagogues who suffer from a lack of confidence represent a minority, and if we try to develop initiative in them, they will become alive because they have preserved their ideas. It seems that this minority outside the center of art pedagogy will achieve deeper security through the new treatment, which won't be the case with those who are very confident of themselves. Such people deal with problems of art education in a new and fresh way, providing wide possibilities for maturing. It seems to me that, within this group, we shall be able to develop a new tendency in art pedagogy. Thus, I would like to say a few words about some tasks we are going to cope with in the future in Switzerland.

It is worth mentioning that in any further education of art pedagogues, spiritual values should be promoted. We should stimulate a so-called internal plan for action. Final plans, pedagogical plans, should not be set. On the contrary, teachers should just base their plans on the situation in the school in which they work. This principle shouldn't be neglected. Maybe the real situation differs from school to school. When we give art educators a course, we shouldn't give them recipes. We should, on the contrary, try to stimulate them to indicate a way, but enable them to make personal discoveries and do personal research work, correcting their mistakes and changing their attitudes, if necessary.

These candidates should be directed less towards academic principles. On the contrary, they should be directed more toward the possibility of change, toward the possibility of manifold development, thus enabling them to grade themselves on their own creative basis. We should provide them with a chance to accept the new role of the art pedagogue. It very often occurs that what is basic in our task and in our work is neglected. The reason is not only bad preparation. It may also be the unfortunate influence on children of different fashions adopted by adults.

The talent for public relations is very rare among art pedagogues. For that reason, the organizations of art pedagogues should try to support and develop their talents wherever they exist. The best way to achieve this is through different exhibitions and lectures; the second is through courses for adults. All the participants there should be required to take part in the discussion and be active.

Adult education in our country has developed during the last few years, and we expect good results. The attitude of the adult man is formed, but he is eager to learn something new. Also, the opinion prevails that understanding art tendencies of the present time can be achieved only through a personal presentation; for that reason there is great interest in organizing such an approach towards art.

Our authorities in Switzerland, as well as in the other countries that have social ideas, consider this side of education very important. In our country, we can't say that the attitude is sufficiently positive. It would be fine if we could establish in Switzerland a tradition in art along with tradition in pedagogy. The improvement of material circumstances, on the one hand, brings a great deal of leisure time and, of course, greater opportunities for using this free time for the further promotion of each individual. However, we should also not forget that, on the other hand, this leisure can lead to a certain saturation which causes the individual very often to neglect the need for spiritual advancement. Therefore, it is necessary to have a twofold impetus: an open approach towards tradition in art, consisting of active participation in discussions, and an explanatory approach to contemporary trends in art. As an example, we could mention the spiritual problems of our times which threaten to numb and petrify us. Some consider material security to be sufficient as one of the basic foundations, but differences among classes are also considered to be important.

When the idea that everyone has the right to education first appeared and when it was finally realized, a certain leveling was unavoidable and, therefore, quite understandable. At this time, various kinds of schools emerged. Then too, there were numerous possibilities for creativity and various talents. During the first six years of primary school, those who were particularly talented were somehow given less attention. We devoted particular attention to those who were weak, while those who had developed any independent abilities were left more or less to themselves. Efforts towards an individual approach in art education, particularly as regards the talented and gifted, should be developed, so that they are given the necessary leadership, which they merit. Not only should the more gifted make up separate classes, but I am becoming more and more convinced that the differences in talent are felt among the children. We must learn that any superficial restriction is against freedom and that it will impoverish the pupil, thereby creating poor artistic mettle.

Every kind of standardization is deadening. With pluralism, I first see the possibility of a very complex situation with different relations existing between the different talent groups within a nation, and within the whole of humanity. I see a possibility of providing the basis for future cooperation.

In the composition of such multiplicity lies the tendency to suppress the so-called cold intellectualism and to substitute for it the strong, irrational aspect of life. Along with this goes the enrichment in our contact with a child as a child and his creative freedom.

I think that artistic education during the last fifty years has developed many new aspects and that in the future much more may be expected. To achieve more, however, our constant efforts in detecting new contents and forms of art education are required. The integration of art education with general education cannot be attained in the same way that a scientist achieves integration. We cannot measure the intensity of our efforts as a scientist can. This cannot be achieved by making art education just transform itself into a copy of a scientific education or by just using verbalistic forms in order to justify art education. Such aims both for formalists and those who imitate them would not suffice. So we must not measure or approve; we must believe, because only in that way will the necessity prevail.

When I communicate a principle to my pupils, the principle contains just the necessary amount of law, which is not to the detriment of artistic freedom.

Here I have in mind external collective laws and internal individual freedom. Our pupils in Switzerland decide this on the lowest rung of the ladder. Escaping from uncertainty, they very eagerly adopt the laws of artistic education. If the teacher points them in the right direction, it becomes the first step towards individual creation. But, we can't say that we achieve this a great deal. We observe order, which is characteristic of our people. Many of them, while still taking into account the so-called irrational minority, consider this as a meditative attitude toward the state.

The difference decreases, nevertheless, and prospects are rather bright for the future that those who are not numerous today will be considered as positive phenomena of creation. There is a possibility that the majority should look into a mirror. In many cases this would be negative rather than positive, and it seems to me that it would be better for a greater number of people to experience what is truly creative freedom--a possibility for almost unlimited enrichment, a possibility for organic integration of all significant forces. That is the basis for intensive relations among people, a higher human phenomenon to which we should aspire. Does this demand include everything? Maybe. It is as a result a most significant factor in art education in Switzerland.

Roca: Thank you, Professor Brigatti.

The next lecture is by Professor Manthey.

An Address: "OBJECTIVE AND SUBJECTIVE ASPECTS OF THE PROCESS OF PICTORIAL CREATION," by Professor Karl Manthey.

Ladies and Gentlemen. It is a great honor for me to be here among you. On behalf of my colleague, Heinrich Witzke, who is sitting beside me, and in my own name, I should like to express our deep gratitude for the kind invitation and for the very warm hospitality accorded to us here. We have come from the German Democratic Republic to beautiful Yugoslavia to see and hear, but in the first place to learn. At the same time, we attach the utmost significance to being among you--among people who share our feelings and who are working on the same task of educating youth in art. We are extremely grateful to the organizers and initiators of this symposium, and we are very happy to be able to attend.

Everything that we have heard and seen here has impressed us deeply. Yesterday evening we saw a very nice collection of children's works in the Yugoslav exhibition, and we have been following with the greatest attention all the lectures and presentations of our eminent colleagues.

Art educators today are faced with the problem of determining their objectives in a clear way. I should just like to join my eminent predecessors in attempting to solve this problem and to refer particularly to one specific point, that is, the methodology of teaching in the process of forming a painting. I do not wish to speak at any length; I just want to submit a report on my experience with children, and to tell you what my main preoccupations were during these efforts.

I think that one of the basic problems is the fact that in the process of creating a work of art, we are always concerned with people who are engaged in creating in a concrete situation. During this process, they are trying to use their creativity and to fulfill a certain task that has been set before them. The process of fulfilling their task is a very complex one.

It is extremely difficult for a teacher to determine what will stimulate each child. How he overcomes his main obstacle, indeed, whether he overcomes it or not, depends largely upon the extent to which he has managed to adapt to the process of creation and to motivate it rationally. The rational motivation of art education is an essential prerequisite for success in our task. And in speaking of success, I do not mean the success which is visible in the works produced. I think it is important to concentrate on the process of creation itself, and to orient our efforts to what is happening within the child's mind during his work, during his process of creation, when he tackles a certain task. In my opinion, and I think that this was already stressed both yesterday and today during the meeting, such motivation has both an objective and a subjective aspect.

As for the objective aspect, it is a matter of solving a particular problem, of completing a task, of acquiring knowledge and ability. In order to be able to use this great wealth, we need a certain amount of systemization. I also believe that the objective necessity expressed here of acquiring and applying artistic possibilities is necessary even in the pedagogical process itself. Thus, we should be realistic and try to give this necessary education. But, we are faced with a great danger; it has already been mentioned by my eminent colleagues that if education takes place only according to materialistic principles, then we become convinced that children should be faced with what is objectively necessary and required by the plan of art education, and we forget that in order to give them further impetus, it is necessary to stimulate every child individually, to give him sufficient space for the play of his imagination. As has been already mentioned, particularly by Professor Brigatti, the predominance of the teacher's goal in art education should be replaced by the manifold activities of each individual pupil. That principle not only stimulates creativeness, but also helps the resultant work of art to be accepted and assimilated.

Then we are faced with another aspect of motivation. From the objective factors in the process of art education, we go to subjective ones. I have already mentioned that the process of educating to the greatest extent is transformed into the realization of the subjective. We believe that the subjective moment, the personal moment, requires greater attention on our part. On the other hand, we believe equally that the subjectiveness cannot be extracted, detached from everything else. Should children be left to themselves? No, at least not always, if we are to have systematic pedagogy. Certain tasks should be fulfilled, tasks which should be above the pupils' personal wishes.

Finally, the problem is to destroy the opinion that the success of art education lies in works of art, in drawings which may be of better or lesser quality. This is not the only criterion. Neither are the criteria uniform results achieved by one class. With such criteria, the pedagogical task may seem to have been fulfilled, but it is very dubious that the task has really been fulfilled from the point of view of art pedagogy. Here we have not only a question of the facts of final achievements, but we must consider whether creative joy is present.

To refine emotion, to make children accept life, all this cannot be presented just vocationally and technically, because that constitutes only one side of great efforts made by art pedagogues. The child, the pupil, is not just our material, the clay which we form, but he is a soul as well, a soul which wants to express itself freely through this process of artistic creation.

In conclusion, I would just like to say that motivation is necessary to guarantee objectivity and continuity. On the other hand, this aspect of indispensable objectivity should not be limited through cold calculations. Rationality is not in question here. Knowledge is not the most important aspect of this experience. The main point here is to enter into deeper layers of the soul. In order to detect what is inside the phenomena of nature and the outside world, this should be understood. If we succeed in our art education, we will have succeeded in gaining the essential prerequisite for man to become refined as a human being.

Here I would also mention the subjective factor and the personal aspect. The pupils who must stick to the task that has been set are limited to that task. Much depends on the task and to what extent it is fixed for the pupils. Each pupil also has the task of proving his individual will, which is very important in the creative situation. It is very difficult to establish these relations. They do not always result spontaneously. We are faced with a long process, and we do not always succeed. Very often we have periods of happiness alternating with periods of sadness. We are very often faced with them. This interchange of joy and sadness is characteristic of our vocation.

It is a kind of prerequisite to point out what is changeable and what is essential, and to make us present subjectively the objective reality around us. In the end, we present both. We should have in mind not only the work of art itself, but also the happiness of creativity in art. The necessity here is a deep sympathy, a sympathy that must have logical aspects, but along with which should also go love of children and love of humanity.

Professor Jankovic spoke yesterday about a heart and reason which should be united. This idea should really be supported, heartily supported; our wish is to avoid the danger, the differences here and there. I can't say that difference always succeeds. New solutions, new motivations, are always our task. Thank you very much.

Discussion

Roca: I now give the floor to Professor Jankovic.

Jankovic: After today's presentations it seems to me that the differences between us indicated at the end of yesterday's session have been mitigated. I would like to agree with what my predecessors said yesterday. Although there were some differences, I think that elements upon which Dr. Tainmont insisted can be discovered as well in the free expression of children. The organization of the composition, the relation between colors--all these things are contained in children's free expression, depending, of course, upon the age group. Maybe these seeming divergences are apparent because we were not able to conceive the idea more deeply in our meeting in Brussels. But the different results may also come from the fact that Professor Tainmont develops his theory on the basis of preparing the educator.

We adopt a different attitude. We concentrate on younger age groups. For this reason, it might be logical that we meet somewhere in between. It is very wrong, however, to build up a closed system--as Dr. Barkan mentioned yesterday in his discussion when he spoke of the necessity for openness. In my paper I also pleaded for us not to close the programs of art education. And Professor Kulenovic also stressed that if we close our circles, we may be faced with academism. I myself would like to dwell on free artistic expression and would use an old pattern in the analysis of the works of art.

Works of art have constant and changeable values. Constant values are well-known to us. That was stressed yesterday during the presentations. The changeable values, on the other hand, depend on the criteria for the class and the influence of the teacher, in general. I pointed out the evolution of children's painting, and we all had the opportunity to see for ourselves that the results achieved by children now are different than they were two decades ago. A sort of qualitative change has occurred, thanks to the better preparation of teachers for their vocation in art education. The influence of the teacher and the newly established criteria are evident. But we cannot satisfy ourselves with what has been achieved. The elements of irrationality should express themselves more freely.

In connection with this I would mention the history of art, which was also discussed yesterday. Our views are identical with Professor Ziegfeld's, that we cannot satisfy ourselves with the history of art for secondary schools and general education in all schools, as for example, in industrial and other vocational schools and technical schools for architecture. In the schools for general education, in order to secure continuity, we would plead for the creative moment in any practical work. This method liberates the pupils from a naturalistic burden, making plastic values more understandable.

In Brussels, we had the opportunity to see the application of what we heard yesterday in Professor Tainmont's presentation concerning analysis of works of arts, which seems to me facilitated establishing a balance between practical work and the analysis of works of art, which is a very interesting combination. In those schools, history of art would merely be taught in a very small number of lessons. This is dictated by relative circumstances. A great number of current authors write about the life of form and plead for it. Thank you.

FOURTH SESSION

Chairman: Dr. Charles M. Dorn

Introductory Remarks

Dorn: We have with us at this session Professor Jaroslav Brozek of Czechoslovakia, who brings us greetings from the National INSEA Committee in Czechoslovakia, which is arranging for the meeting of the 18th Congress of INSEA in Prague. Professor Brozek.

Discussion

Brozek: Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen, allow me to give you a short announcement from Prague. Dr. Uzdil, the President of the National INSEA Committee for Czechoslovakia and President of the Preparatory Committee for the 18th INSEA Congress in Prague, has asked me to extend to this symposium and all of you here his most sincere greetings. I take this opportunity to thank Professor Roca and the other organizers of this symposium for their very kind invitation and the warm reception accorded to us here in Belgrade.

The preparatory work for the Prague Congress is drawing to a close. This will be a very significant session, and an enormous exhibition is being prepared. The program is made up of two hundred reports. They will be divided into plenary and commission meetings. All the work that this entails is not small. Prague and the whole of Czechoslovakia are prepared to give you a very warm welcome. I wish to express the thoughts of our President, who looks forward to meeting you in Prague. Goodbye until next week in Prague. Thank you.

Dorn: Thank you for your greetings, Professor Brozek, and your warm invitation to come to Prague.

I now want to call on Miss Hipwell to ask her to say a few words about art education in England.

Hipwell: Professor Roca asked me last night if I would say a few words about the present trends in art education in England, and it certainly gives me pleasure to do this. I think that something quite extraordinary is happening in our country. There is in all the arts the most amazing upsurge of creativity--not only in the visual arts, but in the other arts as well. And whether one approves of what is happening, whether one approves of the Beatles and their equivalent in Carnaby Street or not, one has to admit that this is happening, and quite obviously it has its roots somewhere. It has its roots partly in the approach to education and partly in our nature as a people. Quite obviously one nation varies from another in many different ways.

I would like to try to explain why I personally think there is this upsurge of creativity, but I would emphasize that I am expressing only my own personal views here. To explain this movement, I have to go back briefly in the history of art education in England. At the beginning of the 19th century, our government debated how best to improve the people's appreciation of good things in art because they were convinced that if they could improve the taste of the people, the people would demand well-designed manufactured articles, and the manufacturer, in turn, would provide them. All of this was debated in Commons. As a result of this discussion, in 1851 the first government art schools were established, and a quite extraordinary thing for England happened. We had the only directed educational program that has ever existed in our country. It is interesting that they programmed art and science together for fifty years. They decided, and this is rather ironic in this day and age, that science was very easily dealt with in terms of education, because all of the facts were known. No others were to be discovered, so this subject was easy to teach. So science was left to develop as it would. But the government established a program, a syllabus, for art education. From that, we learned our very first and most important lesson as a people: that direction of any kind leads to sterility, simply because direction cuts out creativity, or can cut it out if pupils and children are overdirected. This was a very important lesson.

After fifty years, it became obvious that this approach to art education had failed, and so we entered into a new era in which gradually as a result of the work of various outstanding educators, inevitably influenced, of course, by people like Cizek, Whitehead, Marion Richardson, Dewey, and Roger Fry, we tended to use what in our language we called a free approach to education. And the approach did indeed become free. There are many interpretations of this word freedom in art education, as we can see as we listen to it here on this occasion, and observe the results. We learned something important from this approach in our country. We learned that with this method one really did encourage and develop creativity, true creativity. There is something in our makeup that makes us frightened of over-teaching. We as a country are completely free. Every individual, every teacher, is free to formulate ideas, plans, programs, and syllabuses as he wills. And this freedom, coupled with this new development, lasted a long time and added something further to the development of art education in England.

But, perhaps this approach has gone on too long. I certainly am afraid of over-theorizing in art education. I'm certainly afraid of over-teaching. We look at the work of many other places, and we shake our heads and wonder whether it is for us.

Now, in the present day, we come to this upsurge of creativity, to the work that is appearing up and down the country, in every establishment, from nursery schools to colleges of art. We find that these people, left to their own devices, but with a certain amount of requirement from the government, are rethinking their approaches to art education. And something quite remarkable is emerging, I think, something which I am convinced is related to this creativity that is to be found in so many other walks of life. Both in art schools and in the secondary schools, too, students are now being helped to put together the lessons that we have learned from the past: that some direction helps--if that direction means assistance in terms of skills and techniques, but that the utter and complete freedom of the individual is absolutely essential to creativity.

I must say that all of this must be related to everyday life, to general education, to the general cultural knowledge and life of the people. And so the art education of our country is growing closer to the field of general education, tying up with it through the means of everyday life. I think that it is because of the rapprochement between art education and general education and everyday life that we have this upsurge of creativity.

As an art teacher, I have always felt inclined to criticize art teachers, because I think that we have tended to stand in our ivory tower and wait for other people to approach us. Then we shook our heads in sorrow, because we felt that people of other disciplines, the academics, were not paying sufficient attention to our subject, perhaps not giving sufficient honor to it, certainly not using it adequately. I think the fault has been ours, because we have not approached these people ourselves. We have stood aside. We have considered ourselves something special. I think that we need to go out to meet these other people. We need to learn from everything that we have around us, from every opportunity.

If we can add all of this knowledge to the heritage that all of us have in our various countries, then I think that art education will forge ahead everywhere. I think that this is the important lesson which we are busy learning in England at the moment. It has a long way to go. I can add, finally, that I am convinced that gatherings such as this give one the opportunity of culling still further knowledge to help us in our very important work.

Dorn: Thank you, Miss Hipwell.

I now give the floor to Professor Magjer.

Magjer: Honorable delegates, I would just like to tackle a problem and to stimulate some discussion on it, if it is worth discussing. First of all, I want to say that I am thankful and very happy to have heard the brilliant presentations here. I agree with all the basic postulates of all the papers, and I do not speak out of courtesy and out of incapacity to make distinctions. I agree with the essential statements in all the papers, except for one statement made by Professor Barkan, who considered that the bases of the papers were different. Well, I wouldn't agree that this raises as serious a question as Professor Dr. Barkan indicated. He saw a basic difference in the approach to the problems of art education. To answer him, it seems to me that we haven't sufficiently stressed the difference in subject matter of the papers.

Professor Jankovic spoke about general problems concerning art education, and Dr. Soika discussed the art education of school children from the pre-school age up to puberty, whereas the paper by Professor Tainmont was directed to art education in secondary and high school. This means that different problems were discussed and that all were discussed in an appropriate way. We can ask the 17-year-old boy, for example, to paint his impressions from the circus, whereas the 7-year-old child cannot make pictures on the basis of theoretical knowledge. From these examples, everyone will understand what kind of schools are in question and what the role of art education is in them.

Although it was not specifically pointed out in the papers, clearly in one country art education may be treated one way, and in another country in another way. Also, of course, the purpose of art education in the secondary school is different from the drawing lessons in the vocational school for art teachers. I listened to the papers subconsciously as if Yugoslav schools were in question, although I should have been aware of the fact that the system of education is different in different countries.

In our country, the primary aim is to develop the capacities of differentiating basic art values. The purpose is not to teach a child to draw or to paint, but to acquire the capacity to evaluate aesthetic qualities. In one word, the future citizen should be able to distinguish what is beautiful and what is ugly. In our country, we are faced with the problem of methods for art education. To understand our problem one must look at recent history.

Before the second World War, Yugoslavia was an agricultural country; after the War it became an industrial country, and peasants moved from villages to towns. When a peasant comes to town he breaks all the links with his village and the earth from which he derived all of his aesthetic and moral standards. He becomes detached and, as a result of the way of the town, he is surrounded by new and cheap values. From the point of view of art, it is just sham and trash, but this is the only thing accessible, both intellectual and financial.

In any village, even the most remote one, the art pedagogue will work easily with children, if he is familiar with the traditions of the region. He just builds on the strong basic background. But another problem arises with the children of these new town citizens. In some cities we had, before the war, less than 200,000 inhabitants and now we have more than 10 hundred thousand. Here in the mushrooming cities, the art pedagogue has nothing to build upon. He has nothing to develop, because the basis for the development is missing. He must create a basis; he must establish solid foundations for art education. He must create a common ground for the children whose parents came from villages, for those whose parents came from the coast, and for those whose parents were born in the cities, all of whom now live in the same milieu.

Along with building solid, positive foundations for the better understanding of artistic values, the art educator must, at the same time, destroy the strong shell of the trash. This is a rather strenuous and dangerous task. It is a great responsibility as well. If he makes a wrong step, then the love for the value can be destroyed in children forever. There lies, in the majority of cases, our Yugoslav problem, and I believe that similar problems exist in other countries as well. This was unfortunately not mentioned in the paper of Dr. Ziegfeld, or at least not dwelt upon.

For better aesthetic understanding in children who have no art traditions, an adequate method of positive aesthetics would be most useful. I use something similar, which is acceptable for children from ten to fifteen years. Some of my colleagues approve, some disapprove, some are skeptical. Personally, I am convinced that the system is strenuous, but undoubtedly useful, owing to the fact that in our secondary schools there is no art education. At the most critical moment, when our children are fifteen years old, we leave them to themselves and to the trash of their milieu, from the point of view of art education. I thank you for your patience.

Dorn: Professor Didek has asked for the floor.

Didek: I should like to refer to just a small part of all that

I have had the opportunity to hear on the education of children and on the role of the artist in art education aimed at maintaining the creative force and even developing it further. Some of the assets of the artist, the creator, in cooperation with the child, manage to keep up the creative part of a nation. Art creates links among people all over the continents mediating to them through the dimensions of intuition and consciousness. Since we attach the greatest significance to this matter, we have noticed in our analytical research that the relationship between the adult and the child and vice versa can sometimes be deformed if we impose a program of work planned beforehand upon the children, thus putting them in a dependent position in relation to the adults.

At our institute we were completely free to study and compare experiences in teaching. We also used all the international experience we had at our disposal to add to our own knowledge. Therefore, we studied the works of such great art educators as the famous names in the Bauhaus group and Picasso, who several times discussed the relativity of relationships to the appearance of new space distributions in our world. This finally led us to new conclusions in the psychological field. All this was used to maintain among the youth and children that basic nucleus needed for the development of their creativity.

It is my opinion that the sources used for our work require a great deal of discussion and mutual exchange of views, in order on the one hand to develop them in a particular direction and, on the other, to create something very beautiful and good out of the environment we live in. This environment is, in our country, rapidly going through a great transformation, which demands the quick transmission of knowledge from the adults to the children, and which must also take into account all the requests and aspirations of the children to take an active part in the life of adults. We attempt to equip the youth with the experience of adults because we notice that children wish to grow up. We feel that we, as pedagogues, should not set any boundaries between the art of adults and the art of young people because the young want to learn about the secrets of existence and the work of the grownups as soon as possible. That is why we want to treat both the imagination of children and the imagination of adults at once.

There are some common creative assets in the work of young school children of seven to nine years old which coincide in many respects with the work of adults. This phenomenon led us to the conclusion that, in some respects at least, we can assess the work of children critically in accordance with the laws applied to art in general.

We went on with our analysis and determined that art education and our work in this field have much in common with the crafts, which developed through a tradition and which use the same formal processes in order to attain the dimensions of the products of the hand crafts. We included this in our program as well in order to close the gap between the vocation of teaching at our level and at lower levels, attempting thus to eliminate the difference in teaching at lower levels.

Because of the abrupt development of our world and the resulting numerous new problems of a technological, philosophical, artistic, and scientific character, our pedagogical material suddenly became so complex and complicated and so broad that we came to the conclusion that the image of a contemporary art educator should include some more universal points of view, some experiences from all the other branches of activity. This, we thought, was needed in order to create a more complete picture of what the contemporary child, in the service of the contemporary world and in his relationship with other professions, should be and what his contacts as a sociological being should be.

It is clear to us that such a brief reference to this problem of raising the quality of our work to the level of creativeness demands much more detailed study of all the very delicate problems that make it up and which heighten its great cultural value for humanity. Only through studying the work of pupils can we without much more ado get to know people better. We devoted all our attention to this point in order to make young people better informed and better able to make contact with all the types of youth throughout the world. That is why we used several schematic, systematic approaches, in order to simplify from well-known factors which are common to almost all artists, young people, and even artisans; that is, they all wish to compose the elements of their work in such a way that they can make a homogeneous whole and present their basic idea.

Thus, we thought that the composition was more important than any decadent tendencies in the presentation of certain ideas. Our aim was to prepare creativity in such a way that it would correspond to a certain individual as well as to a functional unity. And we found when analyzing nature, when analyzing geometry and mathematics, when analyzing physics and other sciences, that we could see numerous natural elements intertwined with the realistic, elements which are the result of man's activity. When studying these problems we did not forget the poetic foundations which children carry within themselves from the very beginning because their relationship towards the world is a simple one without any prejudices or biases, without any burdens of history, or any other factors which might hinder them from giving full and true expression to their imaginations.

I have tried to suppress the children's feeling that a great distance divides them from the adults, a feeling which prevents children from joining the world of adults quickly. I have tried to suppress this feeling by pointing to the equality between the work of children and adults. I do so because we reached the conclusion, which also appears in many philosophical works, that some adult works retain the elements of children's creativity until death itself. Therefore, I think we are not wrong when we approach the problem of children's creativity at the same time as we approach adults' creativity in order to maintain that freedom and simplicity at a higher level at the academies or in the organized consciousness of our time. That is why we came to the conclusion that art education in the primary schools should be on a very high qualitative level so that we can get a full picture of the aspirations and assets of our world.

Dorn: Thank you, Professor Didek.

I will now call on Dr. Oole.

Oole: Like the other delegates, I should like to take this opportunity to express my appreciation for the opportunity of being here. I shall briefly tell you something about the program of work that I am engaged in, in one of the cities of the United States in the upper midwest part of our country. I come from Minneapolis, Minnesota, which is not our largest city, but one of our middle-sized cities. We have approximately one hundred schools including grades from kindergarten through twelve. Of these, seventy-five are elementary schools and twenty-five are junior and senior high schools. In our system of art education, the classroom teacher who teaches all areas in our elementary schools also teaches art. Assistance to these teachers comes from art resource teachers and the consultant or director of the program, the post which I fill. The junior and senior high schools are served by specially trained teachers who are employed to teach art in these schools.

I would like to point out briefly something of what our concerns are in the development of the art education program in a public school system, which may be typical of this part of the country. If I were to state our chief concern at the elementary school level briefly, I think I would say it in two words: developing awareness. To do this, we try to help the children in our elementary schools--that is, kindergarten through grade six, from about the ages of five through twelve, to explore a variety of art materials purposefully.

We feel that by helping children explore--not accidentally, but in a purposeful manner--a diverse group of art materials, we may help them to develop their own creative capacities in relation to their total pattern of growth and development as they are going through the elementary school years. We find that all children at this age are eager and enthusiastic, and that all have the capacity to enjoy and express themselves individually and personally by working with a variety of materials. We like to help them feel that they are developing and growing, and gaining as they go along in an understanding of the basic elements with which they are working: form, line, space, texture, and color. This, then, is the first form that our developing awareness takes, that of direct working with materials, personal expression.

The second concern, and one which I feel is becoming increasingly important in the thinking of teachers, is a very strong need among children for a growing awareness of the appreciation of art of their own time, as well as of the past. And I might say here that we are concerned, not just with the art of our own area but with world art as a whole. We have in the city of Minneapolis two outstanding art galleries, one which covers the art of all ages as well as it is able to and one which devotes its energies more specifically to contemporary works, not just from the United States, but from other parts of the world as well. We are also provided with many opportunities by The University of Minnesota, which is one of the major universities of the United States. So there are many sources of direct appreciation. We also try to provide our classes with quality reproductions and slides of examples of art from all parts of the world. This, then, is an area in which we help children to gain an increasing awareness of the art of the world, both past and present as they go through the elementary school years.

At the junior and senior high school levels, the emphasis of our program is perhaps slightly different, though there is still great concern for personal expression, allowing for the full development of individual creative capacities through experiences with a variety of art materials. Here we are concerned that the junior high school student gain in self-understanding, learning about his own feelings, his own reactions, his own concerns as he is developing and maturing, growing toward adulthood. We are also concerned that he be aware of his role as a future citizen, developing his relationships with others as he grows toward maturity. So this, then, becomes the essence of the interest in his personal expression at this level. We also want our junior high school students to begin to gain a wider, deeper background of the art of their time and the art of the world and there is a continuing emphasis on appreciation.

In our high schools, which include grades ten through twelve, art is an elective program. Not all students take art at this level, but increasing numbers do choose one or more classes in art during their high school years. And here, too, the personal form of expression is the most important aspect of the program, along with the continuing appreciation of art.

In closing, I would just like to mention what we feel has been one of our greatest needs and explain our attempt to fill it. We have been conducting as many in-service teacher workshops as we can. This means that we go into schools, elementary schools, for example, and work directly with the classroom teachers when the children are not present, giving them experience in working with materials as children might do, so that they know how to handle them, and broadening the experiences that they might have had in their college preparation program, thus helping them to learn how to work with materials. We also have tried to give these teachers, who work with the children but who are not trained art specialists, a richer experience in the appreciation of art. We have conducted a number of these workshops in the past year, and many teachers have indicated that they feel it important to work directly with materials and also to have experiences in appreciation of art.

This topic takes us back, I think, to some of the statements that were made the first day of our conference, when we spoke of the importance of art history, and I think Dr. Barkan referred to the interest here in the possible relationships between art history study and creative art work. It has been our experience that the teachers feel very strongly that the experience in appreciation is more worthwhile when it is combined with the creative experience and the study of the art of the past and the present.

I think perhaps this is enough to tell you something of our program because Dr. Leatherbury is going to tell you something about the program in another one of our cities.

Dorn: Dr. Leatherbury will now describe the art education program in another American city.

Leatherbury: Dr. Oole has described a program which I think is very typical of many of the programs in the United States. I think essentially everything that she indicated about the program in Minneapolis also describes the one which I represent, and I don't want to repeat what she said. However, I would like to mention the uniqueness of our positions. I think that Dr. Oole and I perhaps have positions which are different from those of the other United States delegates to this symposium, and perhaps even different from some of the positions which most of the other members of the symposium hold. We are supervisors or directors of art in large American cities, and in such positions we are in daily contact with classrooms and children and teachers. So, we are concerned with what is happening in a very practical way on a day-to-day basis between children and teachers. Perhaps that makes it more appropriate that we are speaking this morning toward the end of the conference, because I think that everything which has been said during this symposium naturally focuses on what is happening between children and teachers in an art program.

The city that I represent is San Diego, California, which is in the southwestern corner of the United States. You might be interested in knowing that it is the twelfth largest school district in the United States. It has one hundred and sixteen elementary schools, thirty-seven junior and senior high schools, and three junior colleges, which constitute the first two years of college. All of these are operated under one school district; thus, the art program for which I have some leadership responsibility encompasses grades kindergarten through what would be grade fourteen. We have approximately 160,000 students in those grades.

The program at the elementary school, as in Minneapolis, is what we call a self-contained classroom, with the elementary teacher responsible for the art as well as for approximately nineteen other subject areas--reading, writing, arithmetic, science, health, handwriting, and the whole range of other subjects. I mention this because I want to identify one of the new directions in art education in a moment, and it relates to this self-contained classroom. In the secondary schools we have a requirement of one semester of art at the seventh grade level, and, in the high schools, a requirement of three semesters in fine and/or practical arts, which means that the students may elect the visual arts or music, or the boys may choose an industrial arts class and the girls a home economics course. There also is a wide range of elective courses, so that students may elect to follow an art program for their entire secondary school period. Despite a very crowded curriculum, we have some students who elect art throughout their high school years.

I think that all of the papers and the discussions that we have heard during this symposium have pointed towards and emphasized that new directions in art education occur at the classroom level. It seems to me that change takes place only in classrooms where there is interaction between children and teachers. I'd like to identify some of the new directions in art education in San Diego; perhaps they will illustrate some of the directions that are taking place in the country.

In relation to the professional staff, both Dr. Oole and I have mentioned the self-contained classroom at the elementary level, and I indicated to you the wide range of subjects that is taught by the elementary classroom teacher. I think we are experiencing an increasing concern for more specialized help in art at the elementary level, and different school districts are taking different approaches to this problem. In San Diego, we are now working on a resource teacher program in which we identify teachers with strong art backgrounds and place them in schools where they can help other teachers do a better job of teaching art; they arrange for the exchange of classes, so that teachers who are more qualified in art do the art teaching, and teachers who are more qualified in other subjects bring their specialized background to those subjects. At the secondary level, we are particularly concerned with getting highly trained teacher-artists. Our secondary and college teachers include people who are active professionally as artists. They participate fully in professional creative work, and they exhibit their work. The art consultant in our elementary schools is a well-known and competent sculptor and it is this kind of person that we are continuing to look for to teach in the secondary schools and serve as consultants.

A third development, which, it seems to me, constitutes a direction in art education, is the increasing use of community resources, that is, people and agencies in the community which can contribute to the school program. The museums and art galleries, for example, are deeply involved in contributing to classroom programs. But the practicing artist in the community is also brought in to talk to children and to demonstrate how he works. The other week, before I left San Diego, I observed a program that we had with a potter, who came into an elementary school to demonstrate his work. The children observed him and then utilized what they had learned in their own clay modeling. Thus, they had the experience of seeing a potter at work, and they had a chance to talk to him and discover what his problems are as a professional artist.

I think there is also an increasing amount of resource material being made available to teachers. With over one hundred schools and about 2,500 teachers in those schools, it would be utterly impossible for anyone in a position such as mine or Dr. Oole's to affect classroom practice only by supporting teachers, who, in turn, affect practice. We, therefore, have a wide range of resource materials, instructional materials, which teachers can adapt to their methods according to their needs and to the interests of their classes.

To look at curriculum for a moment, I'd like to mention several things. First of all, we have extensive involvement of teachers in curriculum development. Over half of the teachers in San Diego participated, at some time during the year, in curriculum committees, in workshops in which curriculum was developed, discussed, and planned. We think that the active involvement of teachers in curriculum development constitutes strength for establishing new directions.

We are concerned with identifying those aspects of the art program which may be organized sequentially. Sometimes I think that we have not identified the aspects clearly enough, but we are trying to do this in very definite ways. There is increasing concern about what children are learning about art through their involvement in art; thus, the program is not merely free expression, for as they express themselves creatively, they are also learning what they are using in terms of art.

There is also a growing interest in humanities programs, multi-discipline approaches to learning in which art, music, drama, and dance are related to history and other disciplines, so that the students can see the interrelationships of arts. This is a fairly new approach and we are experiencing a rather rapid development of such humanities courses.

At all grade levels, we are also experiencing a growing concern with art history and art appreciation, and teachers are very anxious to give much more attention to these areas. We have implemented the teaching of these subjects with textbooks, reproductions of painting and sculpture and architecture, slide collections, with films and filmstrips, and all types of audio-visual aids; thus, there is this renewed emphasis on art history and appreciation.

While the dominant trend lies in providing art education for all children, and in recognizing the values of creative activity, we also have a program for talented children. In San Diego, we have developed a program in which children at the fifth and sixth grade level, ages ten-eleven-twelve, are identified by their teachers and involved in special Saturday classes.
At the secondary level, they are identified and may be involved in Saturday workshops held on the college campus. The secondary students are invited to a series of art lectures in the evenings, and sometime during the year we have a major exhibition in the museum in San Diego, which demonstrates the talent of our students

to the community, the parents, and the staff.

These are some of the things that we are concerned about in curriculum. In all of these areas the teacher is very deeply involved. I should mention one other thing which seems to me is going to influence art at a rather rapid pace in the next few years. That is the Federal support which is now going into art education, which started for the first time in the last year or so. Through the Arts and Humanities Act, which was passed by the Congress of the United States, funds are being made available to develop programs in the arts and humanities. The development is just getting under way and is very rapidly going to be felt in the classroom. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which was also passed by the Congress, provides for other support to our program; this, too, is very rapidly affecting classroom practice. These are some of the directions in which we are moving in art education on a practical everyday level in one of the major school districts of the United States.

FIFTH SESSION

Chairman: Professor Josip Roca

Discussion

Roca: I would like to open this final session of our symposium by asking Professor Barkan if the question he asked on the first day of our meeting has been answered to his satisfaction.

Barkan: I don't know that I can answer the question as you ask it. Rather than try to answer the question, I would prefer to take advantage of your having mentioned it to try to explain the meaning of the question that I asked. In a certain sense, I really didn't ask a question. What I tried to point out is that there are some useful differences in interpretation, and indeed some useful differences in point of view, that have been expressed by different persons during the several days of our deliberations. At the same time, there have also been some very significant similarities.

More specifically, in regard to the comment I made in reference to the study of art history, permit me to be personal for the moment. I used to think that the way to study art and the way to learn about art--indeed, the way to achieve some artistic wisdom and sensibility--was to learn and have opportunities to work as artists do. As a matter of fact, my own education was strongly pointed in that direction. However, after I began to teach in a university, I spent many hours through the years, talking with people like art historians, art critics, and aestheticians. To my amazement, I discovered that many of these men had never held brush in hand, never chipped away at a piece of stone, never made a pot, never built a piece of sculpture, but they were enormously sensitive to, enormously knowledgeable about, the nature of art. I'm speaking personally, but I would say that a good many other people in art education in the United States have had the same puzzling experience.

Now, the point I tried to make was that possibly there is more than one route to salvation, that is, there may be more than one way to achieve artistic sensibility. I'd even put it more strongly--possibly the diversity among the pupils and the students that we teach requires differences in approaching them. For example, it is possible that some children, some students, might achieve more, might find greater satisfaction, if you will, in direct participation--learning to create works of art--whereas other students might well achieve equal satisfaction from seeing themselves reflected in the magnificent creations of artists in our own day and artists throughout history.

I would say that the conception of this possibility constitutes a relatively new direction in American art education. I don't think we know the answers. However, I do know that we are involved in extensive experimentation and extensive research trying to test the possibilities. My point in mentioning this idea the day before yesterday was to suggest that our consideration of new directions in art education might well include some self-criticism, some reconsideration, and some re-examination of the habitual pattern of education.

I would, therefore, repeat that there might be multiple routes to salvation. I am not certain of the answer, but it might be that for some students a balance between the creation of works of art and what I would call the perception and the apprehension of works of art already created would be profitable, whereas for other students it might be much more profitable to be involved only in the making of works of art. And alternatively, for still others it might be inordinately more profitable simply to learn to see in works of art what artists try to do, what the difference is between the way one artist has achieved his vision, whatever it is that he has tried to paint or sculpt, and what another artist has done, either in our own time or in other ages. For example, compare the theme of Mother and Child that artists have dealt with through the centuries as treated by an artist of the 20th century and say two or three artists of other centuries. What is the meaning of the theme Mother and Child to artists in different times, different ages? These important problems are essentially what the arts deal with. There are many possibilities, but it seems to me that one of the routes to new directions is, indeed, questioning, criticizing ourselves, in fact, doubting what we habitually do, and perhaps testing alternatives.

Historically, in American art education the history of art was taught some thirty to thirty-five years ago. Then, with the emphasis on creative education, and on greater respect for and greater attention to the individuality of children, the traditional teaching of what I would call chronological art history was thrown out of our schools almost entirely. Now we feel the loss of it. But, we are not returning to the conventional, traditional, chronological teaching of art history. Let me simply point out that as soon as a teacher asks a child to look at a painting made in 1960-1966 and compare it to a painting of one hundred years ago, two hundred years ago, fifty years ago, or five centuries ago, the teacher is introducing the historical dimension. The study of art history, I would insist, is not necessarily uncreative. It can be as creative as the active participation in the making of works of art.

Roca: Thank you, Professor Barkan.

Now, I give the floor to Professor Tabakovic.

Tabakovic: At this symposium we have made a great effort to solve a problem that is significant for humanity as a whole and for our culture, namely the struggle against illiteracy in art. In the process of the development of our modern civilization, the division of labor and the necessity for narrow specialization has led to the fragmentation of the individual, depending on what he is required to do by industry and production. Thus, we have an incomplete modern man, a partial man, a man who is a brain, an arm, a foot, an ear, an eye, but not a complete human being. Such degradation of humanity entails serious negative consequences that have a bearing on the individual's feelings and senses. The universal man has disappeared, and along with him have gone the world relations which were to humanize our existence and our mutual relations as well as our cooperation, to the detriment of the development of our culture.

Our common wish and our task is to do everything possible to convince the responsible bodies that literacy in art is very important and that expression and creation through art is equally important to everyday existence. It would be desirable if INSEA, through its organization and activities, could possibly set up institutes in its member states to which common workers could come, enabling the partial man to be transformed into the universal man. At such institutes we could use visual work and auditory work, and all other means to promote humanity and to study culture thoroughly. Thus, we could set up basic principles and provide possibilities for achieving the aims of INSEA, aims which are common to all of us. Thank you for your attention.

Roca: We will now hear a few words from Professor Dodd, from Canada.

Dodd: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If I may just comment on Dr. Barkan's statement, I heartily concur with him in this approach to teaching because I fervently believe in the uniqueness of the child. Therefore, I, too, believe there are many ways of teaching.

Personally, I am concerned with training teachers. One of our greatest concerns in Canada is the problem of trying to introduce original works of art to our teachers. This brings me back to Dr. Barkan and the teaching of art history. We feel that this subject requires a very sensitive teacher who does not dominate and who does not foist off second or third-hand opinions of works of art, but somehow allows the student to come to the work and begin to read it, or try to in some way apprehend what the artist has done. But, I do want to emphasize the importance that we place on the original work, because we do not get the original through the mass media, through slides, through illustrations. We tend to forget the work of the artist in looking at his personality. Rather than seeing the original work we tend to look at the illustration, which, perhaps, is in poor color.

In Canada, where we are spread out over vast distances, we don't often have the opportunity to take our students to museums and galleries to see the original works. We hope that we may be able, to some extent, to bridge this gap through telecommunications, through television. In this way, we may be able to help our studios, our workshops, our classrooms, at the same time bringing the original work to the student and to the teacher.

Roca: I have a few proposals to present to you, and I should like to ask you for your opinion of them. These proposals were made by our colleagues from the United States. There are five items, which all refer to the organization of means of cooperation among nations. The first proposal deals with information and the organization of various forms of exchange. The second is to initiate comparative studies to increase information. The third is to promote the exchange of individuals. The fourth is to study the influence of certain social and other factors upon art education, and the fifth is to encourage the international support of art education by each individual nation. If I have not interpreted these items accurately, I would ask Dr. Dorn to correct me.

Dorn: I think you have interpreted the proposals adequately. These were the topics which I touched on briefly the first day, when Professor Roca asked me to identify the reasons for the development of this symposium. Professor Roca has taken these points up specifically, and I hope they are clear to you.

Now, that we have spent two and a half days in exchanging thoughts about art education and in describing our programs, I think we have done a very successful job of informing one another about the things we value and about the directions in which we wish to work. The proposals Professor Roca has indicated merely make the suggestion that, through our efforts here and at the Congress in Prague, we can begin to develop mechanisms or means by which we can continue this exchange. At this moment, we are asking those of you present for suggestions as to how we may continue this exchange of information, how we can continue to encourage scholars to move from country to country, to spend time and to learn of new methods which are evolving in the many countries represented here. I know personally, and I'm sure that the individuals coming here from America agree with me, that this exchange during these three days has been extremely valuable to us. We have a selfish interest in supporting activities of this kind, because we feel that we are more isolated by distance from the ideas of art education in the world than many of you, and, therefore, the questions which have been raised are questions which we think will help us. I hope that they will help you, too.

At this time, as Professor Roca has indicated, we would like suggestions from you as to how we might do further work together, and as to whether you believe future symposiums of this type, which allow us time to talk with one another and to learn more about each other as persons, would be valuable. If so, perhaps you might make some suggestions as to topics of interest which we could approach for further understanding and development. I certainly hope that our three days here have been a beginning of something that will continue for many years to come.

Hipwell: I'm grateful for the opportunity to add something to what has already been said. I'm particularly impressed by these five points that Professor Roca has just made on behalf of Dr. Dorn. These are ideas that have been in the minds of many INSEA people for a very long time, and indeed, I was recently in correspondence with Dr. Soika on some of these points.

I think that it is particularly important that we should further this work of exchange, and not only the exchange of personal views, as we are exchanging them this morning, but the exchange of experiences, which I think should go right into the classroom, and the exchange of documented knowledge from country to country. I have already made the suggestion, which I would like to put forward again today, that there should be, if we can organize it through our various societies, a clearing house in each country which would see to it that this information was dispersed and that queries were effectively dealt with in a scholarly fashion.

I think that these ideas do need to be implemented, but in a truly scholarly way. I think that we have to make certain that we are not thinking, working, and exchanging merely at the superficial level. I think this is a real danger. As I say, this idea has concerned me for a long, long time. I have myself meditated on the possibility of furthering such work through INSEA. I cannot express strongly enough that I would support these ideas, and how much I would wish to identify myself with them.

I would add another word about the small groups, such as the one which we've had the privilege of attending at the moment. Again, forgive me if I speak from a personal point of view, but I think they are invaluable. Even in the larger congresses, I think that the majority of us would agree that the real value comes when we are able to break up into small groups and really discuss, really exchange ideas. I think the day is gone when people are willing to herd together in large numbers and listen to words, many of which are repetitions of much that has been said before. I don't mean it in a derogatory sense, but we need practical experience, and we need involvement, personal involvement.

Some members of INSEA were kind enough to come to England, some two to three years ago, when we organized a small study group. The members of my society in England felt that the experience was invaluable, and indeed we are at the moment making plans for another such gathering. Now I hope that we will be able to put it under the umbrella of INSEA, whereas originally it was under the auspices of the English Society for Education through Art. I, therefore, wish to add my support to this idea of developing these small groups of people, meeting and discussing, observing, and working in the various countries.

Dorn: I would like to ask a question of Miss Hipwell. You have made the point, I think, that the exchange of information should be both practical and theoretical. From the practical standpoint, what device do you feel would be the most successful and perhaps financially feasible? Would you suggest the exchange of persons to view actual classroom teaching in the various countries?

Hipwell: This was the principle on which we based our study group two or three years ago. I agree that an exchange should ideally take place in the classroom as it were. Of course, one can exchange teachers directly, but I think that it is also extremely valuable for two teachers from different countries and with different approaches to art education to get together on common ground. It was on this idea that we based our study institute three years ago, and we found it invaluable.

There was, however, one immense problem and that is, of course, the problem of finances. We were only able to solve that by receiving all our guests as personal guests, and there are limits as to how far this method can be used. I really am not able to offer a helpful suggestion concerning this particular aspect of the problem, the one of finance. Nevertheless, I am convinced that such an exchange is invaluable. Perhaps one solution that is coming out of the activities of INSEA is the formation of personal friendships, which make it possible for these exchanges to take place with a minimum of expense to the individuals.

Ziegfeld: I would like to comment on the value of small meetings. Not only do I strongly endorse the idea of having meetings which are relatively small in size, but I want to emphasize particularly that it is not only what happens at the meeting itself that is important as it is what continues after the meeting. I was fortunate enough to take part in a meeting in Bristol, England, in 1951--fifteen years ago--and I am still in rather active correspondence and exchange of ideas with perhaps half of the people who were there. Out of that meeting was fostered a great exchange of persons. A number of people came to North America and talked at various times. In other words, a small conference where one has the opportunity not only to get to know people, but to understand something of their ideas, tends to set in motion a whole chain of events which are even greater than the original impact of the conference itself.

Hipwell: I would agree fully with what Dr. Ziegfeld has just said, but I would suggest that it goes even further than this, if I can again refer to the meeting of which I have just spoken. Not only were the people who were involved in that particular meeting immediately put into contact with the people who attended, but they, in their turn, involved other people, and I should say that, as a result of that meeting, several hundred people are already involved in this work.

I would suggest that while it is very interesting, indeed, and very useful to us to meet in this way, we have a duty to other people. I enjoy meeting again many of my friends whom I have met on so many occasions, but it should not be just for us alone to go on meeting in this way. I repeat, I enjoy meeting you all very much, indeed, and I regard you as very dear friends, even though I've perhaps only met some of you through correspondence. I have met others personally, and I look forward to a new meeting. But we should not, as we would say in England, "hog" this experience. We should see that it is spread to other people as well. I think that we have an important duty here, because if we do not do this, then the tremendous value that we are getting from these meetings will not penetrate into our countries, and this, after all, is what we are concerned with--the spread of interest in art education.

Manthey: Ladies and Gentlemen, I have been listening with great attention to these proposals for our further cooperation expressed by our American colleagues, and I think that we should certainly endorse and support all of them. Further, we should now try to determine how to realize these proposals. I agree that one of the most important aspects is meetings between people coming from all parts of the world, which makes possible the establishment of personal contacts and exchanges of views. Here in Belgrade, we have had a wonderful opportunity for such personal contacts which will be of great help to us in our future work, giving us greater possibilities for further progress.

I think that it would be particularly good if we could expand our exchanges of information through professional journals and books in our field that are published in different countries. We shall then be able to see how things are settled in other countries. Perhaps in this way we shall even discover some journals that we have never heard of. I think that INSEA should work toward this constant exchange of information through bibliographies, if in no other way. Through them, we would at least be informed that these journals exist.

I also believe that another proposal is important, the proposal that these meetings should be held at different levels. I think it is particularly important, for instance, that teachers make mutual visits, that they attend lessons in schools, to be able to get acquainted, personally, on the spot, with the method that is used and the way in which the lessons are given.

It would also be useful, from time to time, if we could have scientific conferences which would study some very specific problems, after which documentation and resource material would be presented. I have in mind some special problems, such as, for instance, what the impression of a work of art is upon a child, how the child experiences a work of art at the different stages of his development. Dr. Barkan already spoke about this. I think that it is a very interesting and very complex problem; it would be very interesting to study this problem of perception and reaction to a work of art, and to make this problem a point of concrete research work.

Another topic that was mentioned in the papers and discussions is the relationship between the teacher and his pupil, the problem of direction on the part of the teacher and the problem of free creativity on the pupil. How far should the direction go, to what extent should it be applied, and what should a child achieve before he should be allowed to be free? I think that a lot of thought could be devoted to this matter and a whole variety of experiences and practice could give us material for some research work. This would not necessarily have to be done in a large meeting, but I think that we could discuss and study these problems in the future and thus achieve some exchange of views on these matters.

A third problem which I think we could discuss is the communicative function of art. This subject includes not only paintings and drawings, but also studies of the effects of modern education, a knowledge of which would be of great significance in educating a humanist. These are some of my proposals for some specific problems which I think we could study, the results of which could be presented at a national or international meeting.

Humbert: When we speak of exchange, I would like to mention the special gallery for children's works of art which we have in our city in Sevres. I would here propose that we exchange exhibitions to see the results and works achieved by children. For example, in the gallery at Sevres are the works achieved through the use of positive aesthetics, conducted by Professor Tainmont; then there are the works of children from other countries.

For the exchange, we would be interested in complete documentation of professional literature, syllabus, and slides from some countries. In the United States every school has its program. In our country, we have programs adopted by one whole republic. So, it would be of great value to see what programs are like in other countries. I would like to see the exchange of information among institutions.

I also agree with my English colleague's insistence upon the exchange of those directly involved in the work with children. It is becoming a necessity and I think that this kind of work really should be conducted. In speaking about future meetings, an exchange of approaches would greatly facilitate our mutual understanding. We are very much interested in developing our pedagogical services through museums.

Tainmont: I should like to add an idea to which I personally attach some importance, and that is the idea of combatting the dissipation of ideas. At this meeting, several speakers have stressed the necessity of organizing more meetings. They have done so because they feel the danger of allowing ideas to disappear as they do in large congresses where too many ideas and subjects are mentioned. Small groups and small meetings are one solution to this problem, but there are also others. I think there is a need to limit the topic to be discussed at a meeting, as has been noted by our German friend. He suggested several subjects. If we would take one subject and limit it, I think then we would avoid the danger of allowing ideas to dissipate. I believe that the ideas to be presented on a certain planned subject should be concrete and practical. They should be illustrated, and we should be able to remain at the meeting for some time, so that we can discuss the idea and present our own personal views. In this way, really deep exploration of the question would be stimulated. Usually one speaks for about a quarter of an hour. When fifty people speak for a quarter of an hour, it is difficult for any one to sum up the ideas. They are too varied. If I were in a position to organize a meeting, I would take great pains to avoid such a dispersal of ideas.

In preparing a meeting on positive aesthetics in Belgium, we tried to do this. This meeting did not go beyond the idea of plastic sensibility and its component parts. Thus, we limited our discussions to one particular problem, one which could be developed sufficiently in four days. The people who were present at that congress probably had many different ideas, but they were able to study one subject thoroughly, and I think this prevented them from losing time.

Hipwell: I do agree with Professor Tainmont's point of view—I think it's very important indeed to have these meetings.

Equally, I think, the exchange of ideas is very important indeed for the research work that INSEA could do. I mentioned the scholarly side of art education earlier, and I think that it's absolutely essential for representatives of countries to meet from time to time and to decide on approaches to ideas that could be discussed, work that could be followed up. These approaches should be formulated by people meeting together, so that everyone understands what his mission is, what his terms of reference are. I think that a tremendous amount of time is lost because people are not adequately briefed. Thus, a number of people meet together and talk in a superficial way. This happens because people attempt to do work which has not been planned adequately from a scholarly point of view.

Roca: Before I give the floor to any other speakers who might like to make some more proposals, I shall suggest that a small group meet while we are still in Belgrade to help us, the organizers of this symposium, to summarize our work in the form of some conclusions which we could later send to the participants of this symposium and to other members of INSEA. If you would allow me, I would suggest a few delegates, namely, Professor Jankovic of Yugoslavia, Miss Hipwell from Great Britain, and Dr. Barkan from the United States. They could meet this afternoon or this evening and draft such a summary. Does anyone have any other proposal or any other suggestions for additions to this group? And I also ask anyone else who would like to take part in the discussion to do so.

If nobody else would like to take the floor, allow me, on behalf of the Yugoslav National INSEA Committee, to conclude the work of this symposium and to say a few words and to express my impressions. After that, I will ask Dr. Hoffa to say a few final words on behalf of the sponsors of the symposium, and finally I will call on Dr. Soika, the President of the World INSEA Organization.

I wish to thank all of our colleagues, participants in the symposium, particularly those who presented their reports and participated in the discussions. It seems to me that a large majority of the participants did actively take part in our work, which, of course, greatly contributed to the value of this meeting. I am exceptionally happy to have had the opportunity to attend this meeting, and I can say for my colleagues in Yugoslavia that it was of great value. We shall certainly support the proposals that have been submitted for our future cooperation.

During the sixteen years that I have been working in this profession, I have sometimes been tempted to give up all my efforts, realizing that although the work is beautiful, at the same time it is very strenuous. I sometimes felt that I had two enormous piles of sand, from which I was throwing sand into another, to make a third. It seemed that this job was futile, that our work was futile, because other pedagogues often do not value our work, do not seem to understand us, and do not appreciate this subject. Thanks to the contacts which I have established personally with you lately, as well as to the exhibition that I visited and the literature that I read, I have been encouraged, and I have done my best to encourage my colleagues, too.

In contacts with teachers in schools that I visit, I avoid imposing the many ready-made patterns of work, but I always try, even in the most backward village, to discover what the teacher's ideas are and to establish links between his faraway school and the center. I try to establish contacts between various teachers, because without consultations and contacts our job cannot go forward.

Those teachers who are engaged in training new generations of teachers, and those who in each country are responsible for the quality of education are also obliged to insist that education be on a very high aesthetic level. It is our duty to assist our teachers in the schools, because without these people who are working directly with children there can be no progress in the broadest sense of this word.

This small gathering was, in my opinion, much richer than any other gathering that I have attended, just because each individual expressed his personal point of view. Some also illustrated their views, which is of course always welcome. This kind of meeting enabled us to clarify certain subjects. The older and larger gatherings can also have positive effects, but usually they end just with declarative summaries and resolutions which are printed, but which do not have the really great effect and the weight which such a small gathering can have. I assure you that the Yugoslav National Committee will, in the future, establish and maintain personal contacts with you and with your national committees.

We have great hopes that at a larger meeting and at many other small symposiums we will be able to expand some matters and some information even further. I think that this pre-congress gathering was ground-breaking and that its results will be very useful and will help us to establish contacts with other experts. Information services in all professions are very important. Without information there can be no progress in any profession today. This is particularly true for education. Thus, the Yugoslavs are particularly grateful for the opportunity to attend this meeting. I wish to express our thanks on behalf of all of them. We are very grateful to have had the honor of having you here and of having the opportunity to listen to your presentations. Now I will ask Dr. Hoffa to say a few words.

Hoffa: Thank you, Professor Roca. Like most art educators, I sit here before you wearing several hats. I am an American art educator who happens to work for the government, so consequently I am an American by accident of birth, an artist and teacher by choice, and a governmental official by whim. This morning I'd like to speak to you very briefly in the latter capacity, as an employee of the United States Government, and particularly of that branch of the United States Office of Education which is responsible for the arts and the humanities. We have been, as you know, intimately involved in the planning of this conference for nearly a year and have a concern for it and an interest in it which I think is more than passing. It is a continuing interest, one which I am certain will deepen in succeeding years.

I would like to briefly spell out exactly what I do, because sometimes it is confusing, even to people in my own country, that an art teacher is working as a bureaucrat. The Arts and Humanities Program in the United States Office of Education is new. It came into being less than two years ago. We have specialists in art, music, theater, dance, and film, and we work most directly with the research programs which the Office of Education sponsors. We are not researchers ourselves; however, through the resources which are available to us, we are able to support research which is undertaken by professional associations, by school systems, by colleges, and by universities. This then is our major function. I use the word research, but perhaps I should amplify this a bit because what I mean is research and research-related activities.

One of the programs with which we work is called the Developmental Activities Program; it is a program which we look upon as a "seeding" activity, as a matter of casting seeds out and hoping that they will take root and grow. Now, it was under this program that we conceived of this symposium; consequently, our expectation is that it is a seeding activity, that through it we have devoted effort, energy, and time to cast seeds—and perhaps some fertilizer—in the hope that they will grow.

Normally, I do not like to speak for my other American colleagues. They, as you probably have heard, speak very well for themselves. However, in this instance, I think that I can speak for them and say that in terms of the activity which we have sought, we are enormously gratified. We are grateful beyond words to the organizational efforts which Professor Roca and his group have put forth to bring this meeting about. Our own involvement and our own commitment has been infinitesmally small compared to that which Professor Roca and his group have undertaken.

I should also add that this is the first time we have become involved in any kind of international activity. There are and there will be, through the resources that are at our disposal in Washington, provisions for many of the objectives of this conference. The objectives which Professor Roca read to you a few minutes ago mentioned an exchange of teachers and an exchange of information. I believe that we have some of the facilities for bringing these things about. I believe that the relationship which exists between my office, which is a governmental office, and Dr. Dorn's office, which is a professional association to which people belong voluntarily, is a close one and very fruitful. There are things that each of us can do, and between the two of us I think that we can do a great many things that neither one of us could do separately. This kind of working relationship is, I think, going to be extremely important in terms of the international program which we are hoping will grow out of this symposium. There are reports, for example, of research activities which we have previously supported, which can be made available, either through the channels of INSEA, or through each of you as individuals. There are teacher exchange programs which the Office of Education has supported for a great many years. To the best of my knowledge, not very many art teachers have been involved in these exchanges, and I think that one of the things that I'm going to do when I get back home is to see what can be done to develop some of the possibilities which we have discussed here through the programs which are available in Washington. The same thing would be true for the exchange of curricular materials. My office or Dr. Dorn's office can serve as a clearing house where these materials can be sent for redistribution. Thus, I am here in several capacities.

Up to this point, I have been speaking to you as a Federal employee. I would now like to put on another hat, and speak to you as an art educator, not for my colleagues, but for myself. It has been an enormous pleasure to be with you for the past several days. I have been tremendously enriched by the contacts, both the professional contacts and the personal contacts, the talks, the conversation, the give and take which has been richly rewarding. If there is anything at all that I can possibly do to make sure that these kinds of meetings continue, I assure you it will be done. Thank you.

Dorn: I just want to convey my thanks. The National Art Education Association, as Dr. Hoffa has said, represents some 6,500 teachers of art in the United States. The assistance of the United States Office of Education in conducting this symposium is gratifying to us. We appreciate the efforts of Professor Roca, Professor Jankovic, and the others who have worked diligently for nearly a year to make this symposium possible. I think we are all indeed gratified at this opportunity to be together and to share our views.

I want only to reiterate what Dr. Hoffa has said concerning the variety of literature which our association publishes and has available under its auspices. We have a journal on educational research and philosophy and another journal on the general problems of teaching. We also conduct national conferences within the United States and organize many other activities through which we hope to disseminate the beliefs of our teachers within the United States. I want to offer to you the support of our association, as I have done to Dr. Soika, in any effort that we can make to continue the warm personal contacts that we have had.

I would like again to thank Professor Roca, Professor Kulenovic, Professor Jankovic, and the many other colleagues in Yugoslavia who have done the lion's share of the work here. Our efforts were minimal compared to what these individuals have done to make this symposium a success. I look forward to seeing you all in Prague.

Roca: I now call upon Dr. Soika, the President of the International INSEA Committee, to conclude the work of our meeting.

Soika: Ladies and Gentlemen, we are coming to the end of our symposium. It has been pointed out many times before how valuable and stimulating are such meetings and exchanges of opinion. There is always a vivid exchange of opinions among the representatives of different countries, and I am deeply convinced that all of these ideas will help international art and pedagogy, and will further consolidate and promote our movement. It seems to me that the most important thing to note here is that although different attitudes and approaches exist, basically we all agree. For that reason it would be very well in the future to have congresses and meetings dedicated to given subjects. This proposal has been made before this very often. As long as real problems and real questions exist, art education will exist. Many subjects have been suggested; the problem now is to classify them according to their value and develop them.

I would also like to state that there have never been so many international meetings as there have during the last few years, and many of these have dealt with precise and definite problems in the sphere of art pedagogy. Our readiness to understand each other is a very important basis for our further cooperation on the international plane.

As for the concerns which have been pointed out here by the delegates, particularly by the American delegation, I am glad to tell you that we have been thinking of them for quite a long time, and in Prague we are going to give concrete proposals for setting up four international centers for the development of art education. Through these centers in different countries, we shall be able to exchange opinions and views, we shall organize exhibitions on the basis of exchange, and we will carry out research work. The social factors and the psychological factors will be given priority.

You are well aware of the fact that about fifty percent of the children have not been given any kind of art education, so there is tremendous work we have to deal with. We are at the initial phase of our international cooperation. I would like to allow myself the freedom, in connection with the discussions I've heard here, particularly those with my American colleagues, to state the opinion that a world congress should be organized in New York. In that connection, I have already proposed today that the next congress should have a subject in a clearly defined form, taking our knowledge of the results of this symposium into account. Dr. Dorn, among many others, pointed out the importance of international work and the importance of intensifying it. So, in New York we might have the opportunity to see some of the results.

Finally, Ladies and Gentlemen, I would like to thank all the organizers and all who took part in our work, all those who participated in the discussion, and equally our interpreters and the members of the different institutions. On behalf of INSEA, I would like to thank all those who very kindly took care of us here. I believe that we shall long remember our pleasant days in Belgrade.

To Professor Jankovic, to Professor Roca, and to all the others, as well as to the representatives of the American organization, I would like to reiterate my invitation on behalf of INSEA for you to come and attend the 18th Congress in Prague. You all know that the Congress begins on August 3rd. On the occasion of this Congress, we shall have a great international exhibition and different meetings. I ask you to kindly accept this invitation. Many problems which we have tackled here we shall be able to continue to discuss in Prague. I hope that we shall all meet in Prague and work to the benefit of our common aims. Well, so long until we see you in Prague.

REPORT OF THE SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS COMMITTEE

Following the series of papers which were presented and the discussions which ensued during the International Symposium in Belgrade, Professor Josip Roca, the Chairman of the fifth and final session, called for concluding comments.

From the many remarks, it became apparent immediately that the symposium had been greatly appreciated by everyone. Above all, a very valuable exchange of ideas had taken place, despite the relatively short period of time that the participants had been together. Even in the early stages of the discussions, there was a refreshingly sincere and frank exchange of opinions. While the representatives from the different countries agreed that there was much in common among the ideas they expressed about visual art education, they also revealed and recognized many valuable differences and points of emphasis. The recognition of these commonalities and the continued examination of the differences seemed to demonstrate a promising vitality and a direction for strength in art education. It was suggested that: 1) differences and similarities in the field of art education were fruitful bases for study and investigation; and 2) diversity among individuals--both teachers and pupils--demanded that there should be diversity among the approaches to the study of art education and its many problems and challenges. Both practical and theoretical studies were seen to be valid and necessary.

The small and intimate character of this International Symposium was also discussed at length. Everyone appreciated the careful preparation and the excellent organization of the whole event, and all were very much aware of how much the advance efforts had contributed to the value of the gathering. Beyond this also, the participants were conscious of the invaluable opportunity for the exchange of views that had been provided. It was stimulating and pleasurable indeed to hear the discussions among colleagues from different countries, to hear the presentation and exchange of really informed views, and to be able to move beyond some of the elementary and somewhat superficial concerns in art education. The symposium provided an opportunity to discuss and to concentrate on some fundamental problems in the field of art education. As a result, it was unanimously agreed that: 1) further meetings of such small working groups of representatives from different countries are not only desirable but essential if international progress in art education is to be made; and 2) that the contacts which are established among individuals at such meetings facilitate the further attention and work to be done to resolve the problems in the field.

In the course of the concluding discussion, the following specific proposals were made by Dr. Charles Dorn of the National Art Education Association of the United States:

1) that a mechanism should be devised and a program should be established within INSEA which would both facilitate and insure the international exchange of information and publications;

2) that such a program could and should initiate comparative studies of important aspects of art education;

3) that such a program should work to facilitate the exchange of art educationists among different countries;

4) that such a program should respond to the urgent need for systematic study of the social and cultural forces which are affecting the progress and development of art education; and

5) that the aims of such a program would be served most effectively through the establishment of a permanent institute which would encourage, facilitate, and support the international study of art education.

These proposals met with strong expression of approval and agreement. During the discussion, it was pointed out that similar suggestions had already been submitted to Dr. Soika, the President of INSEA. Participants voiced the opinion that INSEA had now reached the stage where more scholarly and positive work was essential.

The unanimous approval of the above proposals led to some detailed discussion from which the following emerged:

1) The kind of work outlined in the proposals was seen to be of the utmost importance by the representatives of all the countries who participated in the symposium.

2) It was emphasized that INSEA had done good work for many years at the general level in art education, but that the time has come to depart from what was becoming now a rather superficial approach to the problems in art education.

3) An urgent need was expressed for reliable, sound, and scholarly documentation of facts and conditions of the existing scene in art education.

4) An urgent need was expressed for investigation of many specific problems in art education.

5) It was emphasized that all work undertaken by the kind of institute which was proposed should be conducted at an acceptable standard of scholarship.

6) It was emphasized that the exchange of people and information for maximum value should be at both the practical and theoretical levels.

7) It was reiterated that more small meetings of the nature of this International Symposium in Belgrade were essential, and that the participants in such meetings should be people who are both able and willing to disseminate the information in their own countries as widely as possible.

The symposium closed with the reaffirmation of appreciation for the welcome, the generous hospitality, and the excellent organization provided by the Yugoslavian participants, and the leadership of the representatives of the National Art Education Association coupled with the support of the United States Office of Education which made the meeting possible. Above all, there was the reaffirmation of the invaluable educational experience provided by the occasion.

M. E. Hipwell, Great Britain
H. Kulenovic, Yugoslavia
M. Barkan, United States